



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 971 e. $\frac{130}{48.2}$



•

•

•

•

•

•

THE
JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

VOL. II. (NEW SERIES).

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

EDITED BY
B. HARRIS COWPER,

EDITOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN GREEK FROM CODEX A; A SYRIAC GRAMMAR, ETC.

VOL. II. (NEW SERIES).



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1863.

LONDON :
MITCHELL AND SON, PRINTERS,
WARDOUR STREET, W.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME II. (NEW SERIES.)

A

- Adams, Thomas, the works of, 232 ;
account of, 468.
Addi, acts of, 80.
Alexander, Dr., and prophecy, 9.
Alford, Dean, and Bengel, 30 ; refuta-
tion of his expositions, 471.
Anglo-Biblical Institute, 502.
Antiquity, soundings of, 235.
Apocalypse, date of the, 452.
Apocrypha, the Hebrew, 503.
Apollonius of Tyana, life and miracles
of, 88.
Arabic language, grammar of the, 227.
Arithmetic, the criticism of, 257.
Armageddon, the battle of, and Sebas-
topol, 4.
Assyrian antiquities, 256.
Athanasius on the books of the Bible,
105.
Atonement, the, in relation to Hebrews
ix., 47.
Augustine on the canon of the New
Testament, 108.

B

- Baalbec, the supposed names of, 483.
Bardesanes as a Gnostic, 80.
Bayer on the Syriac language, 77.
Bengel and Dean Alford, 30.
Benisch, Dr. his translation of Psalm xi.,
163 ; his remarks on Psalm ii., 451.
Bible, the, and prophecy, 10 ; Rénan's
admiration of, 24 ; translation of,
162, 451 ; introduction to the study
of, 229.

- Biblical chronology, 166.
Biblical criticism, 189.
Biblical passages, explanations of, 177.
Blood on the doorposts of India, 504.
Bohemia, the Protestant clergy in, 282.
Bosanquet, Mr., on Scripture chrono-
logy, 159.
Brentz, Johannes, notice of, 242.
Bunsen and Dr. Williams, 17 ; his idea
of the Apocalypse, 458.

C

- Calvin, his life and writings, 481.
Canon, the Biblical, 102.
Captivity, the Jewish, prophecies about,
9.
Catechesis Evangelica, 230.
Catacombs, Roman, account of, 215.
Christ, birth of, and Isaiah vii., 9 ; a
sermon on by Luther, 235 ; history
of the doctrine of the person of, 244,
475.
Christian charity when ill bestowed, 46.
Christianity, Rénan's views of, 22.
Chronology of the Books of Kings, 343.
Church history, Dr. Waddington on,
232.
Church, mission and extension of the,
at home, 237.
Churches, the Christian, 232 ; an essay
on the Angels of, 238.
Codex Alexandrinus, translation of the
Morning Hymn in the, 448.
Codex Sinaiticus, Simonides on, 248.
Codex Vaticanus, description of, 214.

Codex Rescriptus, Dublin, Dr. Tregelles on, 299.
 Colenso, Bishop, and the Pentateuch, 257; notes on his work, 385; a few words with, 477; a letter from, 496.
 Coleridge's denial of prophecy, 16.
 Constitutions, apostolical, Dr. de Lagarde on, 240.
 Controversy, reasons for mitigating the asperity of, 482.
 Coptic Version of Jeremiah xx., 466.
 Cosmogony, the Scripture, 200.
 Creature, Dean Ellicott on the destiny of the, 27.
 Criticism of John xix., 179, 449.
 Cureton, Canon, his Syriac recension of the four gospels, 79; his zeal in examining manuscripts, 85.
 Cyril's remarks on the New Testament, 108.
 Cyrus and prophecy, 7.

D

Davidson, Dr., on the Books of Kings, 209.
 Day, meaning of the word, 486.
 Deaconesses, history of the order of, 491.
 Deluge, traditions of, amongst the Malays, 254.
 Demetrius and his chronology, 158.
 Difficult texts, exegesis of, 305.
 Dublin Codex Rescriptus, the, 299.

E

Easter, a sermon on, 128; Keble's hymn for, 444.
 Egyptian dynasties of Manetho, 333.
 Egyptians, their notion of the tree of life, 64.
 Ellicott, Dean, on the destiny of the creature, 27; his theory and practice, 28; his misunderstanding of Irenæus, 29; his hopes for others, 46; his argument in respect to the Atonement, 47.
 Ellicott, Rev. E. B., his letters to Dean Alford, 471.
 Ephraem Syrus, remarks on, 81.
 Epiphanius on the books of the Old Testament, 107.
 Ernest Rénan, and his abilities, 21; as a follower of Ewald, 22.
Essays and Reviews, justice to, 16; replies to, 165.
 Ethics, manual of Christian, 470.
 Eusebius on the canonical books, 103.

Excavated prisons, notes on, 431.
 Exegesis of difficult texts, 305.
 Explanation of Psalm lxiii., 434.
 Exodus, date of the, 346.
 Ezekiel, interpretation of, 482.
 Ezra and Nehemiah, Sir I. Newton on, 143, 421.

F

Faber, Mr., and his speculations, 14.
 Fairbairn, Dr., on Ezekiel, 482.
 Faith, remarks on the grounds of, 239; diversity of opinion as to, 484.
 Family altar, incense for the, 243.
 Fortified convents, 440.
 Frankincense, remarks on, 502.

G

Gaussen, Dr., his work on the canon of Holy Scripture, 102.
 German brethren, our, 228.
 Gospels, commentary on the, 477.
 Grammars, Syriac, 83.
 Granada, Luis de, sermon by, 128.
 Griesbach's edition of the New Testament, 245.
 Growth of papal power, 501.

H

Hebrew Apocrypha, 503.
 Hebrew Bible, the first printed, 254.
 Hebrew history and institutions, 486.
 Hebrew Scriptures, the, 253.
 Hebrews ix. and the Atonement, 47; exposition of the Epistle of the, 473.
 Henderson, Dr., and prophecy, 9.
 Historical theology, 290.
 History, the best expounder of prophecy, 3; the papal criminal, 243.
 History of Christian theology, 290.

I

India, blood on the doorposts of, 504.
 Inspiration, Mr. Heard on, 223.
 Interpretation of Scripture, 377.
 Interpreters of prophecy, their speculations, 12; their guessings about Napoleon, 14; the tendency of their blunders, 15; Mr. Jowett on, 18.
 Irenæus and Dean Ellicott, 29.
 Isaiah, a paraphrase of, 235; chap vii. and Matthew i., their bearing, 9.
 Israelites, the, were they armed, 395.

J

- Jacob and his descendants, 261.
Jahn on the administration of Jeremiah, 154.
Jeremiah xx., Coptic version of, 466.
Jerome and his symbols, 16 ; his statement about the Book of Judith, 103 ; his list of the Books of the Old Testament, 107.
Jerusalem and prophecy, 4 ; interesting discovery in, 208 ; Russian buildings at, 281.
Jews, the, in Rome, 215 ; account of the British, 230.
Jewish captivity, predictions about the, 9.
John i. 1, various translations of, 218.
Joseph and his brethren, Bishop Courtenay on, 231.
Josephus on the feast of the passover, 199.
Jowett, Mr., on the abuses of prophetic interpretation, 18 ; his argument on the subject of the Atonement, 47.
Judah, Dr. Colenso on the family of, 398.
Justin and Dr. Williams, 16.

K

- Keble's hymn for Easter Monday, 444.
Keith, Dr., on prophecy, 3 ; his subjects, 14.

L

- Last Supper, the, not a passover, 191.
Library, the old, and its tales, 244.
Literal interpretations of prophecy, 3.
Locke, his tendency to Socinianism, 163.
Luke, St., commentary on Gospel of, 236.
Luther, a sermon by, 235.
Lyons, the rescript against the martyrs of, 328.

M

- Malan, Rev. S. C., on the Authorized Version, 217 ; his translations of John i., 218.
Malays, traditions of the deluge amongst the, 254.
Manetho, Egyptian dynasties of, 333.
Mankind, notes on the scriptural doctrine of the origin of, 431.
Marcus Antoninus as a persecutor, 114, 318 ; his contempt of Christianity, 116.

- Marginal chronology of the Bible, remarks on, 398.
Matthew xxiv. and its prophecy, 9.
Mentz Psalter, the, at Windsor Castle, 500.
Messiah, the, as foretold, 233.
Moyle, Walter, his life, 114.

N

- Nabathæan agriculture, the book of, 226.
Nanæa, account of, 497.
Napoleon, prognostications about, 14.
Nativity of Christ, Martin Luther on, 235.
Nature of prophecy, 2.
New Testament, early editions of the, 82 ; grammars of, 234 ; Griesbach's edition of, 245.
Newton, Sir I., on Ezra and Nehemiah, 143 ; his remarks on the history of the Jews, 147.
Nineveh, Sir H. Rawlinson's discoveries at, 166.
Notes on the Gospels, 473.
Notices of Books, 209, 468.

O

- Old Testament, Dr. Davidson's introduction to, 209 ; commentary on, 485.
Origen, on the Biblical canon, 103.
Origin of language, Rénan on, 22.

P

- Paley on the Pauline epistles, 383.
Palm-tree, its simile, 69.
Papal power, growth of, 501.
Passing children through the fire, 498.
Passover, chronology of our Lord's last, 193 ; table of the feast of the, 198 ; Dr. Hanna on, 237 ; Mr. Franke Parker, letter about its importance, 402.
Perplexities, liturgical, considered, 241.
Pentateuch, Bishop Colenso and the, 258.
Peschito, antiquity and meaning of the, 78 ; Canon Cureton on, 79.
Philology, Rénan's idea of, 22.
Pompeii, discoveries at, 255.
Preachers and preaching, 242.
Predestination, Reuss on, 295.
Presbyterianism, remarks on, 239.
Prideaux, Dean, on the government of Nehemiah, 155.

Prophecy; its nature, interpretation, and uses, 1; history the best expounder of, 3; Dr. Keith on, 3; literal interpreters of, 3; ridicule brought on it by expositors, 5; double sense of, 8; Drs. Henderson and Alexander on, 9; inability to distinguish between fulfilled and unfulfilled, 15; Coleridge's denial of, 16.
 Protestant clergy in Bohemia, 282.
 Psalm xc. as a human composition, 101; xlix., remarks on, 500.

R

Ramah, sepulchre of Samuel in, 127.
 Rawlinson, Sir Henry, his discoveries at Nineveh, 166.
 Reformation, theology of the, 224.
 Reformers, Principal Cunningham on the, 224.
 Religions, the, before Christ, 222.
 Religious philosophy, essays on, 484.
 Rénan, Ernest, on the origin of language, 22, his admiration of the Bible, 24; his disbelief in a future state, 26; his essay on Nabathæan agriculture, 226.
 Resurrection, the, 128; a treatise on, 241.
 Reuss on the history of Christian theology, 290; his idea of Nero, 294.
 Revelation and science, 181.
 Revelation xiv. 20, and interpreters of, 4.
 Reverence to holy places, 242.
 Rome, letters from, and state of religion in, 214.
 Rufinus on the Books of the New Testament, 108.

S

St. Paul, Reuss on the system of, 294.
 St. Thomas, account of the church of, 298.
 Samuel, sepulchre of, in Ramah, 127.
 Schleiermacher and F. Schlegel, 503.
 Scott, Sir Walter, and Crichton castle, 432.
 Scripture, thoughts on Holy, 225; the interpretation of, 377.
 Sebastopol and Armageddon, 4.
 Secularist, a converted, 206.

Sermons on popular subjects, 234.
 Sharpe, Mr., on Psalm xlix., 177.
 Shiloh, explanation of the word, 166.
 Sibbes, Richard, complete works of, 226, 469.
 Simonides, Dr., and the Codex Sinaiticus, 248, 488.
 Stanley, Canon, referred to, 275, 298, 443.
 Students and pastors, thoughts for, 242.
 Sudbury, Archdeacon, a charge by, 243.
 Syriac language and literature, 75; its introduction into Europe, 82; importance of the study of the, 86.

T

"Te Deum," the, 188, 444; Grimm's edition of, 448.
 Texts, obscure, illustrated, 240.
 Tholuck, Dr., his ecclesiastical history, 470.
 Tirshatha, remarks on the word, 427.
 Tischendorf *versus* Tregelles, 178; Simonides and, 251, 489.
 Tree of life, the, 64; its signification, 74.
 Tregelles, Dr., on the Dublin Codex Rescriptus, 299; his opinion of the story of Simonides, 491.

U V

Uncertainty of prophecies, 9.
 Vatican MS., corrections of the copies of, 240; literal translation of the Corinthians in, 241.

W

Waddington, Dr., on Church history, 232.
 What is prophecy? 1.
 Williams, Dr., and history, 16; his objections to Bunsen, 17.
 Windsor Castle, the Mentz Psalter at, 500.
 Wine, new, in old bottles, 223.

X Y

Xavier, Francis, missionary life of, 485.
 Yezidees, visit to the, 493.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

~~~~~  
No. III.—OCTOBER, 1862.  
~~~~~

PROPHECY: ITS NATURE, INTERPRETATION, AND USES.

PROPHECY has been called a history of events written before the events recorded. It is commonly supposed to establish a special relation between the prophet and the Divine Being. Its evidence is less in its utterance than in its accomplishment. Miracles and prophecy often go together, and are in all cases closely allied. Prophecy, indeed, is a mental and spiritual miracle. The prophets often wrought miracles. Their miracles were their credentials before their own age, and led men to listen to their prophecies for the future. Miracles speak first to those who witness them, and then, by their authentic record, to all after-time. Prophecy, on the contrary, rests under a cloud till its accomplishment, and then it takes its proper place in the logic of faith. Before their fulfilment predictions may be believed for various reasons, but assuredly an unaccomplished prophecy stands in a relation to faith and evidences very different from a fulfilled one. It is hardly needful for us to say, that by unaccomplished we do not here mean prophecies which have failed, but those whose time of fulfilment is not arrived. Miracles are a fruit for the present, but prophecies are a seed for the future. The fruit may be preserved for after use, but the seed requires time to spring and germinate.

Our first enquiry will be, What is prophecy? We say to predict, to foretell, and to prophesy, not only when we allude

to the vaticinations of heaven-sent seers, but when we allude to utterances of a very different order. Even in the Scriptures the word prophecy is used of exhortation and of speaking before or in the presence of others. But there is another use of it which must be remembered : we predict an eclipse or transit, we foretell the result of various experiments and calculations, the consequences of certain contingencies, and the doctrine of chances is reduced almost to a science. The chemist is aware beforehand that an acid and an alkali will effervesce if mixed in water. The artist knows that the mixture of yellow and blue will produce a green, and that yellow and red will give him orange. We are quite sure that a thousand things will occur under particular circumstances, and this certainty is of immense value in art and science, and in all the experience of life. There is a sense in which all these things can be called predictions, because we may foretell them. A knowledge of chemistry, or of the laws of motion, or of mental philosophy, has enabled men to anticipate exactly the results of their calculations and processes.

But when we speak of prophecy we do not mean simply preaching, nor do we mean the foretelling of such things as have been mentioned. It is not a prophecy to say a man will die, but if we could name the day, the place, and the manner of his death, that would be a prophecy. Hence an event may be generally certain, but not particularly foreknown. The particular foreknowledge of such an event would be a true prediction or prophecy. Indeed to foretell any event which is beyond the possible reach of calculations, based on science, observation, or experience, is a prophecy. When, therefore, we henceforth speak of prophesying, predicting, or foretelling, we shall refer only to such cases. We shall assume for the present that the power of thus foretelling future events is supernatural. The conditions or tests of a true prophecy have been thus described :

1. There must be sufficient proof that the prophecy appealed to was delivered previously to the event which is said to be its accomplishment.

2. The event or events predicted must be beyond the reach of human sagacity to foresee.

3. The predictions must manifestly themselves receive their appropriate and full accomplishment in the events to which they are said to refer.

So that all events in which these conditions meet are prophesied : events in which all these conditions do not meet are not prophesied. Of course, predictions which are really such are uttered as such, and receive their proper fulfilment. A man might say that the king of Persia would die a violent death, and

it might so happen, and yet there might be no prediction. A prophecy is designed and intended to be a declaration beforehand of something to happen, and not a mere conjecture, which may or may not turn out correct. But while we assert that every real prediction was intentionally such, and must be fulfilled, it could not be safely said that the speaker always knew how and when it would be fulfilled. Often it was so, but assuredly not always, and the divine Inspirer of the prophets alone always knew what the prophecy signified. Let it be remembered, too, that many of the prophecies are wrapped in poetical, figurative, and allegorical language, so that their full meaning is only shewn by the events which fulfil them. Hence it is commonly said that history is the best expounder of prophecy. It might be added, that attempts minutely to explain unfulfilled predictions are usually ridiculous failures.

As to the literal interpretation of prophecy, the principle must not be carried too far; and when we speak of the literal fulfilment of prophecy, it should be always understood that we use the words in a somewhat loose and general sense. There are those who violate this rule. Some students of prophecy insist upon its literal fulfilment, and some disbelievers deny the literal fulfilment altogether. A very popular book by Dr. Keith is entitled, *Evidence of the truth of the Christian Religion, derived from the literal fulfilment of Prophecy*. Now as a matter of fact, very few prophecies have been (or ever will be) *literally* fulfilled. Indeed, to attempt rigidly to adhere to this word "literal," is to do great harm to the cause of truth. The correspondence between a prediction and its fulfilment must be *characteristic* and substantial; it need not be literal. Such an accomplishment will be real, and will inseparably connect the prediction with the event. It will shew that the one is the complement of the other. If we admit this principle, we shall relieve ourselves of many needless difficulties. Some prophecies are obscure, their outlines are very indistinct, their words are figurative, their language is highly wrought and poetical. The literal fulfilment of such prophecies was never intended, it would be absurd to expect it, and is in fact impossible without a series of miracles.

Fashionable expounders of prophecy may talk about literal interpretation, but they do not mean it, or they do not practise it. If they practise it, they make themselves ridiculous. Doubtless many would be very indignant to be told this, but unwelcome truth is none the less truth, and in this particular instance, it is very necessary truth. But we say the literal interpreters are not literal in their interpretations. Sometimes they are

literal enough it must be confessed, but then only to a certain extent. We have heard men of this school say, that the battle of Armageddon will be a literal battle; that the New Jerusalem will be a literal city, which shall come down out of heaven; that the Mount of Olives will one day be cleft in twain; and that when Rev. xiv. 20 is fulfilled, the blood will be to the horse bridles over a space of 1,600 furlongs. To call in question any part of this is denounced as scepticism, rationalism, and the like. We should rather denounce such gross conceptions of God's word as low and carnal, and charge those who entertain them with an imbecility which cannot rise to the height of its spiritual import, but which drags it down to their own level in the dust. Now Armageddon is given as the name of a place; and it is clear that on the literal principle, there ought to be a place of that name. The word means the Mountain of Megiddo, and this at once reminds us of the Valley of Megiddo, which was the scene of several great battles. This at once suggests that the language is figurative, and that the figure is drawn from events already past. There may have been, and indeed there have been, great battles in and round the Valley of Megiddo, since John wrote the book of Revelation, and we might say that the prediction was of one of them. Far more reasonable would this be, and more literal, than the opinion put out during the Russian war, that the siege of Sebastopol was the battle of Armageddon. Certainly the *literal* meaning of Armageddon is not Sebastopol. Whether the battle of Armageddon took place during John's own lifetime, or is yet to occur, is still debated by able men. With regard to the New Jerusalem, the absurdity is yet more apparent, for the *literal* meaning of what the apostle says is, that *he saw* the New Jerusalem come down, just as he says *he saw* a new heaven and a new earth. Why, if he had seen them come down, we must look for other than a literal meaning to his words, whether we look backward or forward.

Another of the predictions we have referred to is that of Zechariah xiv., where we find foretold the siege of Jerusalem by all nations, the capture of the city, and the eventual interposition of the Lord in favour of his people. No man of sane, or at least of sober mind can look for an accomplishment of such a prediction. *All* nations never were and never will be gathered against Jerusalem. The *feet* of Jehovah is surely a figure of speech. Is one of the characteristics of the Millennial state the revival of Judaism? for we read that *all nations are to go every year to Jerusalem* TO KEEP THE FEASTS OF TABERNACLES. Are Jewish sacrifices to be restored? for we read in this same prophecy that all who sacrifice shall come and take the pots of Jerusalem,

and seethe in them. Some there are, and we are ashamed to confess it, who avow their belief that sacrifices will be revived, and Jewish festivals observed in the good time coming. They are consistent, it must be confessed, so far, and are to be honoured for their courage, in carrying their plea for literal interpretation of prophecy to its logical results. But such utter prostration of intellect before an imaginary rule of their own invention is lamentable. We call it a rule of their own invention, because there is not a text in the Bible which lays it down, nor an example which requires it. It is pure assumption, that such prophecies as that of Zechariah are unfulfilled. To say that no event has yet occurred which fully answers to this prediction, proves nothing but a deplorable misunderstanding of prophetic diction. In any case, a literal fulfilment is impossible, and we may rest assured that the Mount of Olives will never cleave asunder in the way supposed.

The other case we have referred to, of the blood to the horse bridles, is equally simple. It is figurative, and not literal. For, be it observed, the blood is said *to come from a wine press!* and every other part of the passage is avowedly figurative. That some great judgment of God is described is certain, but the language is metaphorical. These ultra-literal expositors do grievous harm by their expositions, and mislead men from the true understanding of God's word. They quite miss the sense and intention of prophecy. They publish their day-dreams as the true oracles of God. Nothing deters them from pursuing their reckless course, and steady endeavour to make God's word ridiculous. For it is ridicule which they bring upon the sure word of prophecy. When unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouths of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet, something else is meant, and a literal interpretation is not an interpretation at all. When fire proceeds out of the mouth of the two witnesses, it is not a literal fire. When horses with lions' heads and serpent-like tails are spoken of, something else must be understood. When locusts appear in the form of horses with crowns on their heads, human faces, women's hair, lion's teeth, and scorpion's tails, something else is meant. And so with many other prophetic symbols. And need we say that it is of the essence of a symbol, that it cannot be literally explained? The moment an expression becomes symbolical, it ceases to be literal, and assuredly a great part of prophecy is symbolical. So it has been viewed by all sound expositors, and none but the dull and obtuse modern school of literal interpreters fail to perceive it.

In regard to names of persons, places, and things, to measures of time and space, and much more, no reasonable, intel-

ligent, or true explanation is possible, except on this principle of symbolism.

Let us not be misunderstood. There is danger in the opposite extreme, because some predictions are substantially literal. A great many predictions have a literal *element* in them by which they are defined and identified. This literal element is often surrounded with figures of various kinds, which must be interpreted according to their nature and intention. Nor is it always more difficult to distinguish the real from the ideal, the figurative from the literal, than it is to distinguish between flowers and fruit. God has thought good to adorn and deck his plain, direct intimations of things to come, with what is symbolical, hyperbolical, metaphorical. We cannot wonder at this combination of the literal and the figurative. When the priesthood of the law was instituted, the Lord said to Moses, "Thou shalt make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, for glory and for beauty." There was the real and the actual in the person of the priest, and there was that which was symbolical and ornamental, in his robes of office. It was well understood that, as the poet says,—

"A thing of beauty is a joy for ever."

The oracles of the seers, therefore, were frequently adorned with the graces of poetic diction, not devoid of meaning, but to be distinguished from the literal, which it clothed like the priestly garments "for glory and for beauty." These accessories to the prediction were sometimes obscure. Hence the Psalmist exclaims in Psalm xlix., "I will incline mine ear to a parable; I will open my dark saying upon the harp." And again, in Psalm lxxviii., "I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter dark sayings of old." There were what Solomon calls "the words of the wise and their dark-sayings." The apostles themselves did not understand some of the prophecies until they were fulfilled. A halo of mystery surrounded the predictions, which was not removed till their accomplishment. Probably these predictions would not have been understood even then, but for the literal element which they embodied. The partially literal meaning was a clue to the partially figurative meaning. The extent to which this element pervades prophecy is very great. We may illustrate it by an example. It was said to the serpent which tempted our first parents, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise its (or his) heel." The literal element of this prophecy is, that Satan should be the enemy of man, but that a descendant of Eve should overcome

Satan, though not without personal suffering. The figurative element is that the offspring of Eve should be at enmity with the serpent, that Eve's offspring should bruise the serpent's head, and that the serpent should bruise the heel of the woman's offspring. The literal element of this prophecy was as literally accomplished. Satan has ever been man's enemy. Christ, a descendant of Eve, did gain the victory over Satan; and yet he died upon the cross. The figurative element was also accomplished, but it was figuratively, for the serpent did not literally bruise the heel of Christ, nor did Christ literally bruise the head of the serpent. The serpent was not a literal serpent, but the Devil; and the seed was not the seed in general, but Christ in particular. It may be a truth, and it is one, that Christ represented the whole race in what he did, and that all who believe in Him crush the serpent's head, though they like Him must die. But still the reference is more immediately and directly to the Messiah. Even the Jews themselves refer it ultimately to the Messiah, as appears by the Targum of Jonathan ben Uziel, which thus paraphrases Gen. iii. 15:—"And I will put enmity and hostility between thee and the woman, between the seed of thy son and the seed of her sons; and it shall come to pass, that when the sons of the woman shall keep the commandments of the law, they shall strive to smite thee upon thy head. And when they shall ~~obey~~ on the commandments of the law, thou shalt seek to smite them upon their heels. Nevertheless, there shall be a cure for them, but for thee there shall be no remedy. And they shall obtain a remedy for their heel in the days of the King Messiah." It will be seen by this, that while the Jews applied the passage to the seed of the woman in general, they understood it as referring also to the Messiah. This one instance very well illustrates what we mean by the mixed character of many prophecies, which are partly literal and partly figurative.

There is another example which may be adduced, to make the case still clearer. In Isa. xlv. 28, and xlv. 1, etc., mention is made of Cyrus, who is called the shepherd and anointed of the Lord. This prediction was written many years before Cyrus was born; and its literal elements are very prominent. But along with these are those which are figurative, and which were only figuratively accomplished. It would take too much space to go into this, but anyone who will take the trouble to compare the words of the prophecy with the words of history, will see the correctness of what we say. Cyrus became the instrument of God in chastising the oppressors of Israel, and in promoting the restoration of the people and of Jerusalem a century and three-quarters after the prophecy was given.

One other illustration must suffice. In Malachi iv. 5, we read, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord," etc. Elijah was already dead, and the time referred to in the prediction was yet far distant. A literal coming and preaching of Elijah was not to be looked for. But still the prophecy had a literal element, which was, that some prophet like Elijah should come and preach with great effect before the day of the Lord, whatever that might be. This prophecy, therefore, had a spiritual as well as a literal element, and its fulfilment would be both spiritual or figurative, and actual or literal. We are not left in doubt about this matter, but we have the unquestioned authority and declaration of Christ himself. Our Lord tells us that, not Elijah but John the Baptist was the prophet intended. "This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before my face," etc.; "And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, who was to come." And again, "Elias has come already," etc.; "Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist," (see Matth. xvii. 11—13, etc.). With all this agrees the declaration of the angel to Zacharias in Luke i. 16, 17.

The recognition of literal and figurative elements in prophecy is essential to a rational interpretation. Material images are employed to denote moral and spiritual things. This imagery is borrowed from all the scenes and sources with which the prophets were familiar. Facts in their history supplied it; it was furnished by the rites of their worship; by persons; by places; and by many other things. Without remembering this, more than half the predictions are impenetrable enigmas which defy solution. The neglect of it leads expositors into grievous and dangerous errors. It cannot be too strongly insisted upon in setting forth the nature of prophecy. Indeed, no one denies that many predictions are symbolical, like that of Zechariah, "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness:" or like that of Malachi, "Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven." No fountain ever was or will be able to wash away sin. No day ever was or will be which shall literally burn as an oven.

This brings us to another point which has been very much debated. We refer to the so-called double sense of prophecy. Every figurative prediction has, beyond question, a double sense, a real and a metaphorical one. But when we speak of double sense, we mean, has a prophecy ever a double fulfilment? By some it is denied, and by others affirmed. We are disposed to

say that some prophecies have but one fulfilment, that others have two, and that some may have even more. Here are then three classes of prophecies, upon each of which a word may be said. The existence of the first is admitted by all. Such were many predictions respecting the Jewish captivity, the person and work of Christ, and others. These things were predicted absolutely, and the prophecies were closed when the events occurred. To us they are the records of fulfilled predictions, and we look for no other accomplishment. The second class of predictions is limited in number, and our knowledge of them is almost wholly derived from the New Testament. One celebrated example is given in Matt. i. 22, 23, where we are told that the birth of Christ was a fulfilment of Isa. vii. 14. Now, on looking at the chapter in Isaiah, and reading on in the chapter which follows, we observe two things. First, that the prediction was given on a special occasion; and secondly, that it was fulfilled with reference to that occasion. And yet, we see it expressly declared by St. Matthew, that the prediction was fulfilled in the birth of Christ. Both are correct. The prediction had a first fulfilment, and by an extension of its meaning, it had a second. No doubt the second fulfilment was the ultimate and higher one; and though the first may be regarded as typical, it was none the less an actually predicted event. It was the opinion of Dr. Henderson, that “there is really no prophecy which may not be restricted to one sense—such a sense as fully meets all the exigencies of the connexion in which it occurs.” This opinion is ably maintained by Dr. Alexander, of Edinburgh, who rejects “the theory of a plurality of senses in prophecy.” Other eminent scholars are of the same mind; but it seems to us, on insufficient grounds. To say that the evangelists applied to Christ a prophecy which had been already fulfilled, only throws the difficulty further back.

As to the cases in which prophecies may have several fulfilments, this is only when a series or class of events is foretold. Any of these events is a fulfilment of the prophecy, and it is fulfilled in them all. Thus, when we read that in the last days perilous times shall come, that scoffers shall arise, and the like, we have vague, general predictions of a state of things, and not of single events. This too seems plain, and it might be said that all predictions of this description belong to the first class.

There are prophecies about which there is much uncertainty. Such is the twenty-fourth of Matthew, where our Lord appears to foretell the ruin of Jerusalem, and the actual end of the world. Is this one prophecy, or is it two? If two, how are

they to be distinguished? We cannot here undertake to answer these questions definitely, but we name them to shew that ambiguous predictions are to be met with.

The words of Jeremiah xxxi. 15, are quoted by St. Matthew as a prediction of the massacre of the Bethlehemite children by Herod. But they form part of a prediction relating to circumstances quite different, and indeed scarcely read like a prophecy at all. Yet there stands the declaration of the Gospel, and while we must admit its accuracy, we do not see the reason of it, beyond the fitness of the words to describe the event. Unfortunately, there is no department of Biblical study in which tradition and dogmatism tyrannize as they do in that of prophecy. There are no rules for prophetic interpretation laid down in the Bible itself. The most it does is to afford us examples, and these examples do not represent either every form of prophecy, or every mode of prophetic fulfilment. When we say examples, we mean not imaginary, but real ones; and we ought in strict propriety to say, that the only examples of prophetic interpretation are those which are declared to be such. Prophetic fulfilment and prophetic interpretation are two different things. Prophetic fulfilments are God's work; but prophetic interpretations are the work of man.* Hence it may happen that a known prophecy can have an unknown fulfilment. That is to say, what was given and received as a prediction may be accomplished in an event which may not be ~~seen~~ to be a fulfilment of prophecy. If it were not so, we should be at the mercy of the tribe of prophetic interpreters, from Barnabas down to Mr. Elliott. Men ought to handle such matters very cautiously and reverently, and to speak with great modesty and reserve. But, so far from this being the case, there is no class of persons who are so bold in their speculations, so positive in their conclusions, and so loud in their utterances, as those who harp upon the string of prophecy.

Not to offend the living, we may take an illustration from the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, which, although very ancient, he certainly never wrote. Speaking of the creation in six days, that writer says, "Observe, children, what he says, 'He made an end in six days.' This means that the Lord will make an end of all things in six thousand years; for a day is with Him a thousand years. Now He himself testifies, saying, 'Behold, to day shall be as a thousand years.' Therefore, children, in six days, in six thousand years, all things shall be accomplished.

* This of course does not apply to those prophecies which the inspired writers have declared to be fulfilled.

‘And He rested on the seventh day;’ this means, when His Son comes, and shall abolish the world of the ungodly one, and shall judge the impious, and shall change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then shall he rest pleasantly on the seventh day.” The notion here propounded, that the world would come to an end as an ungodly world at the close of six thousand years, and then enter upon a thousand years of rest, has been perpetuated to our own time. The expression that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, has been also used as an argument for making prophetic days extend over a thousand years. But if one thing is more certain than another, it is, that the world is already more than six thousand years old. If this is a fact, the interpretation falls to the ground. In any case, the supposition that the world should last but six thousand years is purely arbitrary, and based upon no prophecy whatever. The use made of the declaration, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, is equally arbitrary and absurd, because it has nothing whatever to do with prophecy. The whole millenarian theory is a vision. Yet it is received by multitudes, in one form or another, as an article of faith. As to the second coming of Christ, to live and reign on earth at the close of the six thousand years, and to continue thus to live and reign for one thousand, or, as some say, for three hundred and sixty-five thousand years, it is an idea unsupported by a single text. There is no passage in the Bible which tells us such is to be the case. Nay, leaving out of sight the six thousand years, there is not one verse which says that the second coming of Christ shall usher in such a millennium. That there is foretold a second coming of Christ is certain, and it is equally certain that a thousand years’ reign with Christ is spoken of, but the two things are nowhere connected in Scripture. What they are we do not undertake to say, but they can only be connected by a patchwork of prophetic texts and the ingenuity of interpreters. Very pleasant it is, no doubt, to think that Christ will thus come to destroy all his enemies and ours, and to give us a thousand happy years; but what if the expectation should be vain? There are times when certain schools of prophetic interpretation are epidemic, and their contagion is caught by nearly all who belong to the sect or party in which they prevail. But surely a man may hold every evangelical doctrine without being a millenarian. And such is the case. Many of the wisest, best, most orthodox, and most thoughtful Christians have repudiated the millenarian scheme. The truth is, that when one starts upon the study of prophecy with either no intelligent principles to guide him, or none at all, he is in great danger of going astray. It is clear as the sun at

noon-day, that the greater part of those who adopt the system of the millenarians, do not understand the peculiarities of prophetic language, and are in every way unqualified to form an opinion upon the subject. How much wiser and better to confess our ignorance, and to admit that we do not understand ! Unhappily there is no hope of many of this school. They have given themselves up to their pet system, and there is no difficulty which appals them. They have even invented balloons for the conveyance of all nations to worship at Jerusalem in the latter days. For the same purpose they have dried up the Mediterranean, and made railways from all parts of the world to the Holy City. They have so altered the physical features of Palestine and Arabia, as to accommodate the New Jerusalem which their imaginations have builded. Some have not built this city, but made it come down bodily from heaven to earth. This city has been constructed according to the measurements of Ezekiel ; and re-constructed according to the dimensions of St. John. On this latter principle it has been made 12,000 furlongs broad, 12,000 furlongs in length, and 12,000 furlongs high. That is to say, the city forms a solid square 1,500 miles every way. The ground-plan of such a city would be so vast, that a line drawn through it diagonally would be more than 2,100 miles in length. The most distant parts of the city would be about six hundred and sixty miles from its centre. In other words, the city would reach almost from the Greek Islands to the heart of Arabia, and from Armenia to the Great African desert. The Red Sea, the Dead Sea, and the Mediterranean would be as easily disposed of, as the valleys would be exalted and the hills made low. Did these prophetic dreamers ever look at a map ? Do they ever consider that their Jerusalem will swallow up Palestine and half a dozen other countries ? Do they ever reason upon the huge absurdity of a city 1,500 miles high, or ask how locomotion is to be effected in such a place ? The solid contents of such a city would amount to one million two hundred and fifty thousand cubic miles. Who are to be its builders, and where are the materials to come from ? There is no end to the questions we might ask, and we therefore dismiss this gigantic absurdity.

We are not required to believe cunningly-devised fables ; and yet it is considered by some almost to savour of profanity to doubt and condemn these. To our minds, all similar conceptions are low, gross, and material, derogating from the glory of the Spirit, and bringing men under the bondage of the letter. They are feats of intellects led captive by imagination. There is nothing more irrational in the Greek mythology, the Indian

cosmogony, or the Egyptian pantheon. It is this hungering and thirsting after the marvellous and the enormous, this panting for mystery, which gives rise to half the superstitions of Popery, the absurd beliefs of Buddhism, and the monstrosities of all false systems. The result in every case must be to degrade men, and to unfit them for spiritual and intelligent worship.

It is not only in false views of true prophecies that some men take delight; they transform into predictions passages of Scripture which were never meant to be such. Would it be thought possible or credible, that a prophecy has been discovered in the first three verses of the first book of Chronicles? But it is a fact, and at this moment, not a few imagine that a wonderful prediction is contained in these words:—"Adam, Sheth, Enosh, Kenan, Mahalaleel, Jered, Henoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah." A prophecy, and more than that, a Messianic prophecy is here! It has been discovered that by defying all the rules of translation and all the laws of language, these words may be spun into a sentence: "Man placed in misery lamentable, the blessed God shall come down, teaching that his death will send, to humble smitten man, consolation." If the ten names really formed this sentence, it would be a singular circumstance, but not necessarily a prophecy. But the names have not always the meanings assigned to them, as any man deserving to be called a scholar will admit. Yet this rubbish is greedily swallowed by the patrons of prophetic *stromata*, who accept as gospel not only all they find in the Bible, but all they can make out of it. We admit that such ingenious puzzles are pretty specimens of mosaic work, but absurdities if offered in sober earnestness to our faith. They are worse than absurdities, and do positive mischief.

There are some undoubted prophecies which are ambiguous in their terms, and are capable of more applications than one. Many kings might be called northern kings, and many such kings might wage war. Hence interpreters abound who publish or accept any application which is deemed suitable. Some of the predictions are so vague in their terms, that their fulfilment has been confidently looked for in every successive century, and there has been the widest difference of opinion as to what was to be expected. Nearly the only sign of uniformity has been the boldness of each new Œdipus that has arisen, and the obsequiousness of his followers. Master and disciple remind us of that of Virgil:—

"Tantum effata, furens antro se immisit aperto,
Ille ducem haud timidis videntem passibus æquat."^b

^b *Æn.*, vi., 262, 263.

We must not wonder that frequently the prognosticators have guessed aright. Events repeat themselves within certain limits, and similar causes produce like effects. Yet much of the guessing has been wrong. How many prognostications have been realized and disappointed in Napoleon! How often has the prophetic clock been put back! We have a long list of dates given for the fall of Antichrist, the second coming, and the end of the world. Very curious this list is, and reaches over centuries. Disappointment seems only to have called forth new speculators. And still the procession continues. Not a few believe that we are now within four or five years of the consummation. It may be so, but we know who said, "Of that day and of that hour knoweth no man."

There must be failure so long as men try to do what Mr. Faber undertook; viz. :—

1. To assign to each prophetic symbol its proper, definite meaning, and never to vary from that meaning;

2. To allow no interpretation of a prophecy to be valid, except the prophecy agree, in every particular, with the event to which it is supposed to relate;

3. And to deny that any link of a chronological prophecy is capable of receiving its accomplishment in more than one event.

All these principles involve a knowledge which no man can possess, and therefore no man can successfully apply them. There are nevertheless many true and useful things in the Dissertations of Mr. Faber. And the same is true of almost all the leading books upon the subject with which we are acquainted. It is the mixed character of works on the prophecies in general, which creates our difficulty, because they almost all contain inconsistent and impossible explanations, as well as those which are just and right.

Many predictions have been strangely and even wonderfully accomplished, and such are those which Dr. Keith principally deals with. To prevent mistake, we will enumerate them. They are the prophecies respecting Christ and the Christian religion, the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews, Judea, Ammon, Moab, Edom, Philistia, Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, Egypt, the Arabs, the Africans, and the seven churches of Asia. To all these prophecies we can point as affording triumphant proof of divine inspiration. All the conditions of prophecy are fulfilled in them; and no one can compare the predictions with their events without seeing the hand of God in them. We regard these as an argument for believing that all other predictions of Scripture either have been accomplished, or will be accomplished.

But there are two points which we must mention. First,

that there is no record of the fulfilment of some prophecies, which have no doubt been fulfilled ; or if the record exists, we have failed to connect it with the prediction. The second point is, that there are numerous predictions which are still unfulfilled. Inability or failure to distinguish between fulfilled and unfulfilled prophecies has led to a multitude of errors. The restoration of the Jews is, we believe, not predicted by any prophet after the captivity, and was fulfilled when the Jews came back to their own land. Other predictions which seem to refer to the Jews, really belong to the Church of Christ. This is denied by some ; and some have gone so far as to assert that there is no prophecy at all in the Old Testament, of the state of the Gentile Church.

It is our conviction that these blunders are impediments to the spread of the truth, and that they reveal a surprising measure of credulity among Christians. They reveal ignorance as well as credulity. They make known a morbid craving after an insight into the future, a prying curiosity into the secret counsels of God, which cannot be too strongly reprehended and discouraged. They turn the Bible into a book of riddles and enigmas. They prevent its wise, intelligent, and profitable study. They promote an idle inquisitiveness, which is injurious if not fatal to edification. We may be told that students of prophecy are wise and good, zealous and devout, and we believe it all ; but we believe too, that they would be wiser and better, and quite as zealous and devout, if they gave less time to it, and more to the study of other things. When men find prophecies in all the miracles and parables of Christ, in moral precepts and genealogical tables, they are on the high road to all that is incongruous and absurd.

And now we come to another matter, and one of which we have not lost sight, although we thought it best to confess and condemn the sins of orthodox Christians first. Evangelical Christians have erred, and grievously erred, in their indulgence of the modern millenarian school in its countless vagaries. They have looked on with patience and almost approval, while men holding the same doctrines have been wasting their energies in building castles in the air. They have neglected the study of prophecy on true principles, and surrendered it almost wholly to those whose principles are false. But, in the meantime, another foe is in the field, a foe who not merely denies the faith in one or more of its details, but who either calls prophecies a delusion, or says that they have failed. Unbelief of prophecy may have been promoted by untenable interpretations of it.

We will not now speak of those who deny prophecies altogether, though we might say much on that subject. We will

only speak of those who are represented by some recent writers, who, without denying prophecies altogether, express themselves in such a way as to throw discredit upon predictions of Holy Scripture. He who says a prediction is but a guess, or was written after the event, or was a failure, really denies it to be a prediction at all. Such things are said in the *Essays and Reviews*. And yet let us be just to the authors of that volume. Dr. Williams, for instance, is not wholly wrong when he says of some, that "Accustomed to be told that modern history is expressed by the prophets in a riddle, which requires only a key to it, they are disappointed to hear of moral lessons, however important." For is it not true that the writings of the prophets, are often viewed as occupied exclusively with predictions? But it is not so. Not only are there historical narratives in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, there are true sermons, moral and spiritual lessons, inspired no doubt, but still sermons and exhortations, not predictions. Again we agree with Dr. Williams in rejecting the notions of Justin when he could argue, "that by the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria, were intended the Magi and their gifts, and that the king of Assyria signified king Herod;" or of Jerome when he could say, "No one doubts that by Chaldæans are meant demons, and the Shunammite Abishag could be no other than heavenly wisdom for the honour of David's old age,—not to mention such things as Lot's daughters symbolizing the Jewish and Gentile churches." Dr. Williams could have added that this principle of interpretation is still followed, and that no small part of the Old Testament is turned into prophetic symbols. There were doubtless many such symbols, but it is needless, erroneous, and dangerous to symbolize everything.

We also admit that "prophecy tended to a system more spiritual than that of Levi;" but probably not in the sense Dr. Williams intends. "Butler," he says, "foresaw the possibility that every prophecy in the Old Testament might have its elucidation in contemporaneous history." Where Butler foresaw this he does not say, and we do not remember, but it is itself a prediction as unreasonable as can be, and may have been misunderstood. We complain of his unfairness when he says Chandler "thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic; others restricted this character to five. Paley ventures to quote only one." Dr. Williams must know that it was generally conceded that the prophecies had a double sense, a near as well as a remote fulfilment; and it is unjust to ignore all but such as are assumed to relate only and solely to Christ. Coleridge, it may be, denied prognostication or prophecy alto-

gether, but Coleridge was not infallible, and his denial of any part of Scripture does not prove it false. We could add the names of not a few distinguished men, Bible critics, and poets too, who have denied the prophecies; but why do this? Our essayist does not tell us why he makes the statements we have referred to, and yet it is clear enough that it is due to his partiality for Germany. There he sees Eichhorn and Ewald, Herder and Gesenius, and doubtless many others, whose pathway "streams with light," because their labours have uniformly raised the moral element of prophecy, and lowered that of the directly predictive. Had they been able, some of them would have lowered the predictive element into the waters of Lethe altogether, and reduced the prophecies either to guesses, or revelations written after the event. Happily they have failed in this. Much, however, as we disagree with Dr. Williams, we wish everybody knew how far the majority of *sound* German critics are in advance of most of us in the understanding of prophecy. Noble and true men we have had and have, but, alas! far more numerous have been they of the Cumming and Elliott school. Among us, the piety of a man sanctifies his critical vagaries.

The process of reasoning by which Dr. Williams represents Bunsen as putting out of court David, Nahum, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Zechariah, Micah, Hosea, and Daniel, is ingenious, but superficial. In truth the objections which he makes can be answered, and have been answered. We do not envy the man who can terminate this phantasmagoria by saying, "Great then is Bunsen's merit, in accepting frankly the belief of scholars, and yet not despairing of Hebrew prophecy as a witness to the kingdom of God." Among all the prophets and prophecies enumerated, nothing is conceded, everything is denied except what this rather trenchant sentence includes. "When so vast an induction on the destructive side has been gone through, it avails little that some passages may be doubtful, one perhaps in Zechariah, and one in Isaiah capable of being made directly Messianic, and a chapter possibly in Deuteronomy foreshadowing the final fall of Jerusalem. Even these few cases, the remnant of so much confident rhetoric, tend to melt, if they are not already melted, in the crucible of searching inquiry!" One is confounded by such language. Of all the supposed predictions of the Old Testament, scarcely a relic remains unrefuted; and the remnants which remain "tend to melt, if they are not already melted, in the crucible of searching inquiry!"

Yet Dr. Williams thinks we need not despair of Hebrew prophecy as a witness to the kingdom of God. He thinks this forlorn hope justified so long as we recognize the true moral

basis of prophetic utterance; all the better if we can add a metaphysical basis for prophecy; but it is not safe to go so far as Bunsen, who, after all, had "a notion of foresight by vision of particulars." True, this was but a kind of clairvoyance, a mere natural gift, and consistent with fallibility, but even this is too much for a writer who wants to see only presentiment or sagacity.

Now bad as millenarianism is, it is better than this, because its credulity is not unaccompanied by a living faith in true predictions. But here is a cold, dead, unbelieving rejection, heartless and cruel, of every supernatural element in prophecy. If the moral and perceptive principles which permeate the prophetic page are honoured, it is well, and we applaud it, but we protest with all the energy of our souls against this exclusion of God as the inspirer of the prophets, witnessing to the future through their agency. Either God spake at sundry times and in divers manners to the fathers by the prophets, or their "Thus saith the Lord" is a delusion; the testimony of Christ is a delusion, and that of his apostles is false. With our faith in prophecy gone, all our faith is imperilled.

Dr. Williams says much more than this, but we leave him in order to say one word about a truly estimable, but too mistaken, writer; we mean Mr. Jowett. This writer makes some wholesome and judicious remarks upon the abuses of prophetic interpretation. In these we frankly, and without hesitation, concur. For truth is truth, and wherever we find it we ought to confess it. It is a precious gem of priceless value, and must not be repudiated. But there are things in his essay from which we utterly dissent. Such is the following: "The failure of a prophecy is never admitted, in spite of Scripture and of history (Jer. xxxvi. 30; Isaiah xxiii.; Amos vii. 10—17); the mention of a name later than the supposed age of the prophet is not allowed, as in other writings, to be taken in evidence of the date (Isaiah xlv. 1)." Here we are told of prophecies which failed. There have been pretended prophecies which have failed. There have been true prophecies, like those of Jonah, which were conditional, and were not fulfilled. But the predictions quoted were not such. Jeremiah xxxvi. 30 (compare xxii. 19, 30), has been declared unfulfilled by Hitzig, and falsely; Jehoiakim's posterity did not succeed him. The prophet did not say that he should have no successor, but that "none of his" should sit upon the throne, which was a fact. Isaiah xxiii. foretells the miserable overthrow of Tyre, and assuredly this was fulfilled, nor did she ever recover her proud pre-eminence, notwithstanding her partial restoration. The passage in Amos has

been misunderstood; it is a false prophecy put into his mouth by his enemies, and no prophecy of his at all, as any one may see who will read the tenth verse. How Mr. Jowett could make such a blunder is inexplicable, but we must believe it unintentional. As for the mention of Cyrus, it is challenged because it occurs in those chapters which some critics have believed spurious because the prophecies in them are so plain. We cannot go into this question, but refer the reader to the arguments by which the genuineness has been defended by Dr. Alexander and others. It is enough for our purpose that the New Testament quotes these prophecies as Isaiah's. There is no end to carping, to misrepresentation, and groundless assumption.

Assuming that there are many prophecies in Scripture, and these prophecies appear in various forms, the question rises, what are their uses? Let us endeavour to say; and we observe first of all the remarkable illustration they afford of the divine prescience or foreknowledge. Perhaps it is not too much to say that prophecy furnishes us with the only known example of God's foreknowledge. It is absolute and not conditional, direct and not attained by calculation. Our foreknowledge, even when it is most absolute, is not without conditions, and is invariably the result of reasoning. A clockmaker knows when the clock will strike, and what will be its movements, provided it remain in order, and be attended to. Every machine is constructed with a certain knowledge of its action and the results thereof. If the harvest is deficient we know that bread will be scarce and dear. Past experience teaches us that times of popular excitement may be sometimes expected. But with this, and much more, we have no foreknowledge of the actions of free agents, nor of their destinies. We do not even know what kind of harvest we shall have next year, nor what weather we shall have a month hence. In prophecy God shews how he can triumph over all the limitations by which we are confined, and that he knows the end from the beginning.

Another use of prophecy is to teach us various important principles of the divine government, and to bring out in a most striking manner various features of the divine will. It shews how mindful he is of human actions, and how he will reward men even in this world according to their works. It shews us the destiny which is in store for his people, and the judgments which shall overtake his enemies.

Hence it is admirably adapted to instruct us in our duty, and to encourage us in its performance. We are led to believe that our conduct will be recompensed in a similar manner, and that we are under the operation of the same laws. It stimulates

us in our endeavours to promote the spread of truth and all that is right and good.

The prophetical books involve moral and religious precepts of universal application. So numerous are these preceptive portions, that, in the estimation of some, they were written as a rule of life more than as a revelation of the future. This opinion is a mistaken one, but so is that which simply looks upon them as a revelation of the future.

Neither should we overlook the fact that the prophetical books contain many valuable narratives, descriptions, and allusions, which throw great light upon history, geography, commerce, ancient idolatries, manners and customs, etc.

The prophetical books also include symbols and visions, which are by no means always necessarily predictive. They may set forth things which are, and ought to be, as well as things which should come to pass. By the careful study of these our knowledge of God's will may be increased, and we may have a better understanding of what is purely prophetical.

The prophecies are not all yet fulfilled, and an earnest examination of unfulfilled predictions will be of much service in enabling us to anticipate the destiny of the world and of the church.

The age and authorship of the prophecies is to be ascertained in the same way as the age and authorship of the other portions of Scripture. Considerable confirmations of some of them may be found in the study of history, and the antiquarian remains of Assyria, Egypt, and other countries.

The fulfilment of the prophecies is to be sought for in the other books of the Bible, in the records and present condition of the lands, cities, and nations, to which they refer, and in the state of the Jewish and Christian churches. By such means we arrive at the fullest conviction that holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and amid all the obscurities which hang over some of the predictions, we discover the clearest indications that the prophecies were not a dead letter, but divine intimations of things to come.

ERNEST RÉNAN.

It has, perhaps, been too generally taken for granted by believers that the incredulity of their opponents was due to some moral defect. Possibly some of the early heretics who were accused of the most abominable crimes were not so much worse than the orthodox. Of course, if it is assumed that unbelief *must* be owing to some moral deformity, it will always be possible to find out *some* flaw in your opponent's character which may be made to support the theory; though it may not always be easy to establish the connexion between the two. It never seems to have occurred to the minds of some that the most orthodox are not invariably the most virtuous, and that if the most exact creed might be maintained in the midst of an irregular life, infidelity and immorality might possibly exist independently of each other. At the present day, at least, many of the writers who are constantly denounced as infidels and heretics, as Pantheists and Atheists, are men of laborious and blameless lives, earnest defenders of the claims of morality, keenly alive to spiritual impressions, even grave and respected professors of theology. Whatever amount of truth, therefore, there may be in the old theory above mentioned, it will not do as a general answer to doubts and objections. Strong as we may feel ourselves in our own faith, it will be well for us to listen to other enquirers, to whom the merit of learning and candour at least cannot be denied, and who have come to different conclusions from ourselves. With this conviction, we intend to offer a slight sketch of the religious opinions of a very distinguished French writer, E. Rénan. A man of profound learning, of the highest character, of varied sympathies, and original genius, he yet stands outside the pale of Christianity, and, though by no means hostile to it, disbelieves in it as a supernatural revelation. His claims to be heard are many. To the investigation of the Old Testament he brings an unrivalled acquaintance with the Hebrew and kindred languages, and with Jewish philosophy, as evidenced by his *History of the Semitic Languages* and his work on *Averroés*. To this must be added a perfect familiarity with the modern theology of Germany, a delicate appreciation of poetry, a genuine admiration of all good and noble feeling and conduct, and a deep conviction of the importance and of the eternity of religion.

Before we go on to speak more particularly of his religious views, it may be permitted to say a few words on his interesting work, *The Origin of Language*, especially as it is on his philological attainments that his fame principally rests.

•

Rénan considers the origin of language to be not artificial, but instinctive or spontaneous. He disagrees with Grimm's theory of a development from a monosyllabic state and a few hundreds of roots, and rejects the classification of Turanian languages proposed by Bunsen and Max Müller. He differs from those distinguished scholars in thinking that no approximation has been discovered between the great families of languages, and so, further, that the evidence of philology is against the probability of one original language from which the rest were derived. "However different from one another," he says, "may be the groups which form the Indo-European family, one can explain perfectly how they belong to the same type, and might arise from a primitive idiom. We shall never succeed in the same way in extracting the system of the Semitic languages from the system of the Indo-European, or *vice versa*. Compared in respect of grammar, these two families appear to us as radically distinct, by the confession of even the philologists who have tried to fuse them together. The feeble grammatical resemblances which are remarked between them are sufficiently explained by the identity of the human mind acting in the same manner on different points at once. Compared as to their vocabularies, they offer at first sight some seductive approximations. But, besides that the number of these has been singularly exaggerated in reliance on the most superficial or insufficient analogies, there are very few of them which are not accounted for by intrinsic reasons, without compelling us to have recourse to a community of origin."^a

In connexion with Rénan's philological labours may be mentioned his very beautiful translations of Job and of Solomon's Song, accompanied by preliminary essays. In the discussions regarding these poems, as in his view of Jewish history, he is in the main a follower of Ewald, but his tendencies are more conservative. He is of opinion that we are not to expect the same regularity and consistency in Oriental poems as we are accustomed to amongst ourselves, and are not forthwith to treat as interpolations whatever does not at first sight appear to fit into the poems according to the approved rules of poetry or drama.

In passing on to speak of Rénan's views of Christianity, we must first observe that he displays the greatest anxiety not to be considered an opponent of religion. He professes a profound belief in the real existence of God, and in the importance of an established religion. It is true that his expressions as to the

^a *De l'Origine du Langage*. Ed. 3. Paris, 1859, p. 206, 7.

former are somewhat vague ; we prefer here to quote his own words :—" Sous une forme ou sous une autre, Dieu sera toujours le résumé de nos besoins supra-sensibles, la catégorie de l'idéal (c'est à dire la forme sous laquelle nous concevons l'idéal) comme l'espace et le temps sont les catégories des corps (c'est à dire les formes sous lesquelles nous concevons les corps). En d'autres termes, l'homme placé devant les choses belles, bonnes ou vraies, sort de lui-même, et suspendre par un charme céleste, anéantit sa chétive personnalité, s'exalte, s'absorbe. Qu'est-ce que cela, si ce n'est adorer?"^b This quotation is taken from his *Essay on Feuerbach* and the new Hegelian School, which he treats with some severity, attributing their professed atheism to a "German pedantry of boldness." As to the importance of an established religion his expressions are clearer. "For the immense majority of men," he says, "the established religion is the only part of their life devoted to the worship of the ideal. To suppress or to enfeeble in the classes which are deprived of other means of education, this great and sole remembrance of nobleness is to lower human nature, and to take away from it the characteristic difference between it and the brute creation."^c

He acknowledges, with perhaps a slight tone of regret, the advantages of an undoubting faith. He maintains that the simple mind finds in its spontaneous instincts an ample compensation for what it lacks on the side of reflection.^d

Believing all religions to be imperfect^e—a proposition which he supports by reasoning similar to that of Mr. Mansel in his *Bampton Lectures*—but sympathizing with all that is good and true wherever it exists—he finds points of contact with all forms of faith, with Christ and with Mahomet, with Channing and with the Saints of the Middle Ages. His general conclusion^f is, that religion, being an integral part of human nature, is true in its essence, and that beyond the particular forms of worship, necessarily sullied by the defects incident to the times and countries to which they belong, religion itself remains, an evident token in man of a superior destiny. The last words of his *Essay on the Religions of Antiquity* are these :—" Thus the immense labour, of which we have endeavoured to sketch the history, finishes with a conclusion at the same time consolatory and religious ; for if man by a spontaneous effort aspires to seize the infinite cause, and is obstinately bent on passing beyond nature, is this not a great sign that by his origin and destiny he

^b *Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse.* Ed. 3. Paris, 1858, p. 419.

^c *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Pref.).

^e *Ibid.*, p. 9.

^d *Ibid.*, p. 17 (Pref.).

^f *Ibid.*, p. 18.

goes beyond the limit of finite things? At the sight of his efforts, unceasingly renewed, to scale heaven, one gains respect for human nature, and is persuaded that this nature is noble, and that there is ground for being proud of it. Then also one is reassured against the threatenings of the future. It may be that all that we love, all that forms in our eyes the ornamental part of life, liberal culture of the mind, science, high art, may be destined to endure but for a time; but religion will not die. She will remain as the eternal protest of the spirit against the materialism of systems or of brutishness which would imprison man in the inferior region of vulgar life. Civilization is lost from time to time (*a des intermittences*), but religion never (*n'en a pas*)."^g Consistently with this shadowy idea of an "un-attached" religion, Rénan speaks of artists as the only preachers suitable to the present age. At the close of a very beautiful essay on Ary Scheffer's Picture of the Temptation of Christ, he repudiates the charge of scepticism commonly brought against men of the present day. He says that our faith is no longer one of formulas only because we have learnt to consider all formulas inadequate, but that our faith in essential truth is sincere and humble. Art, therefore, disregarding controversy, and seizing the ideal forms of beauty and moral worth, rises above objections and inspires faith. Art teaches truth, and is the voice of nature disengaged from all scholastic symbols and exclusive dogmas.^h But Rénan's language often approaches much more nearly the orthodox standard. He displays throughout his writings a genuine admiration of the Bible and of the character of Christ; and, as a Biblical critic, he is much more conservative than the Germans generally. He prefers to consider the Scripture history as legendary rather than mythical,ⁱ believing that there is a considerable basis of fact to be found in it; and he borrows the forcible argument of M. Colani against Strauss, that the faith of the apostles is altogether inexplicable on any other supposition.^k It must not be concealed, however, that his point of view is entirely different from that of Christians. In proof of this, it is sufficient to remark that it is a fundamental principle with him that there can be no such thing as a miracle.^l He carefully guards himself against being considered a materialist philosopher, but, at the same time, he denies altogether everything supernatural or miraculous, all particular interventions of the Divine Being in the series of physical or psychological events.^m He is not of course a follower of the old

^g *Etudes*, etc., p. 71.

^h *Ibid.*, etc., p. 431-2.

ⁱ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

^k *Ibid.*, p. 168.

^l *Ib.*, p. 7, Pref., and p. 206.

^m *Ib.*, p. 137 note.

rationalistic school of Eichhorn and Paulus, but he is a thorough rationalist in the larger sense of the word. Everything must be explained by rational causes, and whatever cannot be so explained is mythical. Protestantism he regards as an inconsistent and imperfect form of rationalism, stopping short at an arbitrary limit.* Roman Catholicism, on the other hand, especially according to the development theory, appears to him more philosophical and more unassailable. Early prepossessions, perhaps, and his love of art and poetry, may have something to do with this preference. For it is evident that he considers Protestantism essentially domestic, honest, and simple, but, at the same time, rather chilling and prosaic, and, perhaps, a little bit vulgar. Whilst Mahometanism he treats with a good deal of tenderness, regarding it as a somewhat less encumbered form of rationalism, and thinking it in no danger from critical enquiry.º

It is difficult to see how we can argue with one who starts with such principles. He rejects the supernatural, but ridicules those who attempt to pare away the supernatural from the Bible, upon which we rest as the revelation of truth. But we may be allowed to point out the apparent insufficiency of his explanation of acknowledged facts. With regard to Christianity, he is much enamoured of the development theory, and so, whilst adopting and exaggerating the worst features of the Roman Catholic creed,º he endeavours to shew that the change in habits and life introduced by Christianity was at first very slight.¶ Yet these suggestions are of small weight compared to the admission which he freely makes of the undeniable truth of the main facts of the Gospel narrative. Eichhorn and Paulus being exploded, the confession of the facts seems fatal to any purely rationalistic theory. So, too, he has a strange idea that the excellence of the Jewish religion was owing to the monotheistic tendencies of the Semitic race. Monotheism was with the Semitic race, he thinks, a primitive intuition,⁹ a divine message entrusted to its charge for diffusion among mankind. Without discussing the previous question whether races have intuitions or not, it is enough to observe that, as a matter of fact, neither the Semitic races in general, nor even the Jews in particular, have shewn any special devotion to Monotheism. The Babylonian mythology was large and complicated. The Phœnicians and Syrians were devoted to the most licentious and cruel forms of idolatry;—to “Moloch, horrid king,” to “Astarte, queen of heaven,” and to “Thammuz,

* *Etudes*, p. 378, sqq.

⁹ P. 58-9.

º *Ib.*, p. 297.

⁹ P. 411 and p. 212.

⁹ P. 86.

yearly wounded !”¹ No one can need being reminded how difficult it was to keep the people of Israel themselves from falling away, and from sharing the abominations of their neighbours.

“ Nor did Israel ’scape
The infection, when their borrowed gold composed
The calf in Horeb ; and the rebel king
Doubled that sin in Bethel and in Dan.”

We have left to the last a truly painful topic, our author’s apparent disbelief in a future state. He thinks the idea of “ the immortality of the soul ” a refinement upon the true and primitive Christian doctrine of the resurrection and triumph of the saints of the earth ; a philosophical dogma which appeared much later, and was never assimilated into the Christian scheme.²

A philosophical dogma may be explained philosophically, and, under that treatment, it well nigh disappears. Immortality is not for the individual, but for his works ;—final success not for the man himself, but for justice in the abstract ; future perfection, not for the poor human soul, but for the divine progressive work which humanity is ever accomplishing.” We are by no means sure that we comprehend the meaning of these fine phrases, but they seem, after all, but a poor consolation for suffering and dying creatures like ourselves ; an unsatisfactory result of critical enquiry and philosophical speculation. If we did not believe that Rénan’s own faith was deeper and more ineradicable than, for the sake of his method, he is willing to allow, even his great learning and his attractive style might have made us altogether indifferent to his pretensions as a religious philosopher. *Talis cum sis, utinam noster esses.*

F. T. C.



¹ Milton, *Paradise Lost*, b. i.

² *Ibid*, p. 90, Pref.

¹ *Le Livre de Job*, p. 87, Pref.

DEAN ELLICOTT ON THE DESTINY OF THE CREATURE.*

WE conclude that it was by design, rather than accident, that a second edition of this work has made its appearance at the same time with the *Aids to Faith*, in which the author has taken so conspicuous a part. In any event, it is fortunate that we are thus able to contemplate the rule and the example together. In the *Aids to Faith* we have the author's theory, in the *Destiny of the Creature*, his practice.

This volume contains six sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in the first four of which, the destiny of the creature is considered under the following heads:—Vanity, Suffering, Death, Restitution. The first of these is founded upon Rom. viii. 20, 21. "The creature was made subject to vanity," etc., and as this may be taken as a fair sample of the whole work, and an illustration of the author's method of interpreting Scripture, we shall endeavour to learn from it, how far that method is consistent with the rules of interpretation which he himself has prescribed in the *Aids to Faith*; and also, how far it warrants him in looking down with pity and sorrow upon those who may happen to prefer some other mode of interpretation.

When divested of the rhetorical, and it must be admitted, very beautiful, language in which they are couched, the author's principal propositions may be thus stated.

That the *creature*, to which, or to whom, St. Paul here alluded as being made subject to vanity, was all creation, "animate and inanimate, which stands in any degree of relation to man." Whether man himself is to be considered as falling within this category, does not clearly appear; from some expressions it would seem that the author so intended, while from others it seems that he did not.

Next comes the question "*whence*," by which it seems is here meant, *from whom*, came this condition. We are told that we are not to attribute it to Adam, and thus refer to a mere man what seems to involve the providence and agency of God. As little are we at liberty to ascribe it to Satan, and thus introduce conceptions of a destroyer and adversary in a text which tells alone of the sovereign will of a creator and a restorer, but that we cannot consistently believe it to be other than God,

* *The Destiny of the Creature, and other Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge.* By Charles John Ellicott, B.D., Dean of Exeter, and Professor of Divinity, King's College, London. Second edition.

who was moved to subject his creation to this mournful law. The nature of the condition of vanity is next considered ; and it is stated to consist in a subjection of the brute creatures and the wide-spread plant world to thwarted development and stunted growth, to something more than perishableness, and worse than decay ; that the creation was subjected to something more frightfully generic than death or corruption, to something almost worse than non-existence—to purposelessness, to an inability to realize its natural tendencies, to baffled endeavours, to mocked expectation. And lastly, it is affirmed, that it is sin that has caused all this, “ that has cast this shade on creation, and drawn the bar sinister across the broad shield of the handiwork of God.” We are obliged to quote the author’s words, for the expressions are *sui generis*, and can hardly be paraphrased.

We shall deal with each proposition in its order ; and we think it will appear to our readers, as it does to ourselves, that the Dean’s practice is but a faint reflex of his precepts, and that the Christian faith is not likely to be much aided by such discourses as these, affording, as we believe they do, an additional proof, if any were needed, that eminent ability in philological studies is not alone sufficient to guard against the misunderstanding and misinterpretation of Scripture. Perhaps, indeed, it would not be too much to say, that scholastic skill, like other good gifts, is as often as not, a snare and impediment in the way of the true comprehension of Scripture. Men are wont to concentrate their energies upon those things which they feel they can do well, and thus a critic (especially when under the influence of doctrinal bias) not seldom places too much reliance upon verbal criticism to the exclusion of broader and sounder views. How often do we find, as Professor Moses Stuart has well observed, that “ special interpretation stood in the way of general views, the explanation of words indeed, hindered the discerning of the course of thought.”

It might have been expected, that in a discourse delivered by a scholar so able, before an assembly so illustrious, and that upon a passage which he describes as both important and difficult, he would not have considered it a wasting of his own, or his auditors’ time, if he had given his reasons for thinking that the word “ creature ” was to be restricted to the brute and the inanimate creature only, or at least was designed to include them. Instead of this, he has quietly assumed the most material point, viz., the meaning of the word “ creature,” on the latitude to be assigned to which, as he truly observes, the interpretation of the passage mainly depends ; and instead of assigning a reason for the faith that is in him, he contents him-

self with informing his readers, that “without occupying their time with detailed reasons, he cannot doubt that Irenæus and the Greek fathers were right in giving to the term creation (creature) its widest application, and in referring it to all creation, animate and inanimate, that stands in any degree of relation to man.”

On collating the passage from Irenæus, which is referred to in support of this assertion, we were astonished to find that it conveys no such meaning as is here attributed to it; and since the Dean is as incapable of misrepresenting the original, as of misunderstanding it, we are forced to conclude that he has not looked at it, but contented himself with quoting a few lines from some other author's quotation, and thus the passage, dislocated from its proper context, is made to convey an erroneous impression of the author's meaning. We subjoin the whole passage,^b from which it will be seen, that Irenæus was not speaking of the destiny of the creature in the sense of the brute and inanimate creation, but only of the destiny of the *saints*, of their state at our Lord's second coming, “*mysterium justorum resurrectionis*.” With regard to this, he observes that it is just and reasonable that, in that very condition in which *they* were once afflicted, they should receive the recompense of their sufferings, in that in which *they* were slain for the love of God, they should be made alive again, and that they should reign in that in which *they* were once in bondage; and he goes on to say, that on this account it is necessary that *their* condition (not that of any other creature or order) should be restored as it was at the first, in order that it may serve (or fulfil) the purpose of the righteous. What is here meant is not very clear, but certainly it is *not* meant that irrational and inanimate creatures were to be restored to some former condition of excellence; the

^b Quoniam igitur transferuntur quorundam sententiæ ab hereticis sermonibus, et sunt ignorantes dispositiones Dei et mysterium justorum resurrectionis et Regni, quod est principium incorruptelæ, per quod Regnum qui digni fuerint, paulatim assuescunt capere Deum: necessarium est autem dicere de illis, quoniam oportet justos primos in conditione hac quæ renovatur, ad apparitionem Dei resurgentes recipere promissionem hæreditatis, quam Deus promisit patribus, et regnare in ea: post deinde fieri judicium. In qua enim conditione laboraverunt, sive afflicti sunt, omnibus modis probati per sufferentiam, justum est in ipsa recipere eos fructus sufferentiæ: et qua conditione interfecti sunt propter Dei dilectionem, in ipsa vivificari: et in qua conditione servitutem sustinuerunt, in ipsa regnare eos. Dives enim in omnibus Deus et omnia sunt ejus. Oportet ergo *et ipsam conditionem reintegratam ad pristinum*, sine prohibitionem servire justis: et hoc Apostolus fecit manifestum in ea quæ est ad Romanos, sic dicens: Nam expectatio creaturæ revelationem filiorum Dei expectat. Vanitati enim creatura subjecta est, non volens sed propter eum qui subjecit in spe: quoniam et ipsa creatura liberabitur a servitute corruptelæ in libertatem gloriæ filiorum Dei.”—Irenæi *Adversus Hæreses*, lib. v., cap. 32.

only condition to be restored or regained is that in which the saints were when *they* suffered, and were in bondage, and were slain. Irenæus, therefore, cannot be quoted as an authority for the author's proposition; and further, it is certain that some of the most eminent of the Greek fathers held the contrary opinion; but, however this may be, it is not very material to the question. We have the same materials upon which to form a judgment as were afforded to the fathers, in some respects perhaps better; and we might reasonably expect to be informed, not only what the conclusion was at which so accomplished a critic as Dr. Ellicott had arrived, but also the grounds upon which that conclusion rested. Since, however, he has concealed his reasons we cannot quarrel with them, but we may be pardoned for doubting the proposition thus arbitrarily laid down, being satisfied that such a result can only be arrived at through an entire disregard of the tenor of the apostle's argument, and by imputing to him sentiments inconsistent with his plain declarations on other occasions, and doing violence to other express statements of Scripture, as well as to those deductions of our reason which, so long as they do not conflict with scriptural truth, we may, and indeed must, rely upon for our guidance.

It cannot be doubted, indeed it is in effect admitted, that the apostle may *possibly* have meant by this word "*κτίσις*" to describe the rational or human, as distinguished from the irrational or brute creatures, and the inanimate earth. Origen and Augustine concur in this view, and when their opinions happen to coincide, they are entitled to no slight weight. To these might be added a vast number of eminent names of ancient and modern times, including some of the most eminent German commentators. Apart, however, from patristic or other authority, it is certain that the apostles and other sacred writers occasionally employed this word to describe the rational creature alone. We ourselves often do the same in a familiar or trivial sense, as when we speak of some one of our acquaintance as a poor creature, a despicable creature, a good or amiable creature. In Mark xvi. 15, the disciples are enjoined to go forth into the world and preach the gospel, "*πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*," to every creature; and in Colossians i. 23, St. Paul speaks of that gospel whereof he himself was made a minister as preached, "*ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν*." These passages, although bearing so immediately upon the subject, are altogether unnoticed by Dr. Ellicott; and Dean Alford (asserting that "*κτίσις*" appears never in the New Testament to be used of mankind alone) adopts Bengel's explanation of our Lord's injunction, as

meaning that the gospel was to be preached primarily to mankind, and derivatively, through them, to the rest of the creation. So then, these glad tidings were to be proclaimed, first, to those who *could* receive and understand them; and next, to those who *could not*.

If then it be conceded, as indeed it cannot be denied, that this word may possibly have been designed to refer to the human or rational creature alone, rather than to the brute and inanimate creation, it remains only to consider *which* of these two methods is to be preferred as most scriptural, and most reasonable; and viewing the subject under this aspect, it will, we think, be obvious, that that interpretation which is allowable is also imperative, and that the view taken by the Dean must be altogether rejected, and that, too, upon the principles which he himself has laid down with so much precision in the *Aids to Faith*.

In order to a correct apprehension of the meaning of this particular expression, it is essential, first, to consider the topic upon which the apostle was engaged. He begins by reminding his disciples that there was no condemnation to those who were in Christ Jesus; that the law of the spirit of life had made him free from the law of sin and death; that those who were in the flesh could not please God, but that they themselves were not in the flesh, but in the spirit; that they had received the spirit of adoption, and that the Spirit bore witness with their spirit that they were the children of God, and if children then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, if so be that we suffer with him. Having set before them these consolatory assurances, he adds, by way of expansion of the sentiment already expressed, "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us;" and then follow those sentences in which mention is made of "the creature," first, as waiting earnestly for the manifestation of the sons of God; then, as being made subject to vanity, not willingly; next, as waiting to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God; and lastly, every creature is said to be groaning and travailing in pain together, and not "only so" (οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ, etc.), but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption (redemption) of our body, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.

Then speaking as well of himself as of those whom he addressed, the apostle reminds them that we are saved by hope; that the Spirit helped their infirmities, and made intercession for them; that all things work together for good for them that love God; and he closes the passage with the exulting and most

eloquent appeal—that noble defiance of the cares and calamities of this mortal life which Christianity, and Christianity alone, can inspire—“Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

Such is the outline of this famous discourse, the subject one of the most animating of which we can conceive; the language adequate to such a theme, such indeed as could hardly be uttered save by him who, when rapt into paradise, had “heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter.” But fervid as is this language, and far beyond all human eloquence, it is not assumed, as high sounding phrases in our own day often are, to cover the obscurity, or hide the poverty, of the writer’s sentiments. The argument is as logical and perfect as the language is beautiful. It is not a dissertation on cosmology or any other branch of natural history; those, indeed, were topics with which he who was called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, who determined not to know anything, save Jesus Christ and him crucified, was not likely to concern himself; they formed no part of his mission. It was an address of earnest consolation and encouragement to his disciples, an exulting pæan, a hymn of triumph over the contempt and persecution to which those poor dispirited converts were subject, and which he called upon them to endure as he himself endured, “as seeing him that is invisible.” And if this be so, how can we believe that he would obscure an argument so vigorous and sustained, by casting into its midst a proposition altogether incongruous? The argument is, throughout, personal; in almost every line the apostle speaks of “us,” and “we,” and “I,” and “ye.” The destiny of the creature, in the sense of the brute and inanimate creation, had no nearer relation to this topic, than it had to the doctrine of the Trinity or the Atonement. Indeed, it may be said that every word here written would have been just as true and pertinent, if the brutes and the inanimate creation had never existed, or, existing, had not been subjected to their supposed condition of vanity or purposelessness.

The author evidently feels this difficulty, but does not allow it to stand in his way; he says that this text is a striking and notable instance of a class of passages often half isolated from the argument, emerging suddenly from a more restricted con-

text, gathering up what has seemed specific into declarations most comprehensively general. If, however, it is to be read in the sense for which he contends, the passage is not half, but wholly isolated from the argument. Neither can it be regarded as an illustration, since St. Paul, like other writers, was accustomed to derive his illustrations from familiar objects, and the supposed subjection of the irrational and inanimate creatures, to that condition of purposelessness of which the author speaks, was never recognized either by this apostle or any other sacred writer; and indeed, as we shall presently shew, it is a tenet expressly opposed to the teachings of Scripture.

Not only, however, was it alike foreign to St. Paul's office and mission in the church, and irrelevant to his argument, to say anything about the destiny of the brute and inanimate creatures, but it is also obvious that the meaning which the author has assigned to this phrase must be rejected, if, adopting the canon which he himself has enunciated in the *Aids to Faith*, we should judge of the meaning by a reference to the immediate context. He says:—

“A third rule of very great importance, and of a very wide range of application, may be stated as follows:—Develop and enunciate the meaning under the limitations assigned by the context, or, in other words, *interpret contextually*. Whenever we are in difficulty as to the justice or pertinence of a deduction, or find, as we often do find, that grammatical considerations leave us in a state of uncertainty, the context is that which acts as the final arbiter. Our rule has thus two great uses,—the one on the negative side, the other on the affirmative. Under the first aspect, it serves to restrain improper deductions or applications; under the second, it helps in deciding between two or more competing interpretations, each supposed to be grammatically tenable.”

Judged of by this rule, which, although not particularly novel, is altogether unobjectionable, the apostle's expressions will be found to be applicable to the human or rational creature, and to him only. The same word (*κτίσις*) occurs in four consecutive sentences, and, although in their zeal to square the Scripture to their theology, some interpreters (abandoning in that respect the ancient version) have rendered the word in the twenty-second verse differently from the same word in the other three verses, and some commentators have not scrupled to give it an essentially different meaning, yet such a practice is obviously so unreasonable as to be altogether indefensible.

The creature, then, which is described as made subject to vanity, must be regarded as identical with that which is referred to in the preceding sentence, and in those which immediately follow. But can it be believed that the apostle meant that the

brute animals, and the materials of which this earth is composed, are beings which, if not rational, are at least possessed of those faculties which are never found unless associated with reason, and which, indeed, would be valueless, if not impossible, without it?—as, for instance, with *wills* which can be disregarded or controlled, *patience* under afflictions, and *hope* of a more prosperous condition; and that thus it was that he attributed to them an earnest waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God, and an expectation that they should be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. What these expressions mean it is not material here to inquire; but we may be certain that they were *not* meant to teach us that the fowls, the fishes, and the quadrupeds, the rocks, the plants, and waters, were endowed with those faculties which we are wont to regard as the prerogative of the human race, or that they are waiting and yearning for the arrival of a change, which, unless we believe them to be intelligent beings now, we cannot believe they will understand when it shall arrive. Yet this is not a mere inference from the author's statement, but is expressly affirmed by him. Having, as we have seen, asserted, that in some incomprehensible manner, the earth, with its vegetable and animal kingdoms, had been afflicted or punished by the loss of some condition of excellence, he proceeds (we presume, by way of compensation for so grievous a calamity) to endow them with faculties which are equally the offspring of his fervid imagination, since he does not scruple to ascribe to them the possession of an intelligent will, the virtue of submission, and hope. Man's sin, we are told, "Caused creation involuntarily and reluctantly (what a mournful and suggestive antithesis lies in these words, not willing!) to submit itself to the effect of an act committed with the full assent of a rational will." And again, "While faith in the form of belief to the Christian, and dim intuitions to the heathen, is the prerogative of the rational creature, hope is the gift that has not been denied to the irrational creation; hope is common to all, hope binds nature and mankind in a close and enduring union." We should not wonder to find that such a belief was held by—

"The poor Indian, whose untutored mind
Sees God in clouds, and hears him in the wind;
And thinks, admitted to yon equal sky,
His faithful dog shall bear him company."

But it does, and well may, surprise us to find such doctrine preached by an English professor of divinity before an English University.

The subject is too serious to be treated lightly; but it is impossible to avoid some reflections upon the anomalous state of things which this proposition involves. Surely, the author cannot seriously intend, that the pen and ink with which he writes, men's worn-out implements, and weapons, and clothes, and furniture, the plants and animals upon which they feed, the air they breathe, and the soil on which they tread, are all sentient creatures, eagerly looking forward to some happier condition, some *millennium* of their own, and bearing their present sorrows with meekness, in the certainty that it will sooner or later arrive.

There is yet another argument against the Dean's view of this passage; one which has often been brought forward, and never refuted, and which the author very prudently leaves altogether unnoticed. Having said in verse 23 that every creature was groaning and travailing for its expected deliverance, St. Paul adds, "and not only *so*" (*not* as the Authorized Version has it, "not only *they*") "but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body."

This statement is evidently introduced in order to give weight to the argument, and to render the previous statement more specific by shewing his disciples that even they, favoured as they were, were not exempt from the common lot of humanity, the condition of vanity. But if it should be concluded that the creature spoken of in verse 23 was the brute and inanimate creation alone, it would follow that St. Paul was instituting a comparison between himself and the Roman converts on the one hand, and the brute beasts on the other, or rather, he was placing both in precisely the same category as regards this condition of expectation and travail, and that he altogether disregarded the rest of mankind,—those who had *not* then the first-fruits of the Spirit, but who might nevertheless at some future time attain thereto. We think that neither the apostle nor his master was accustomed thus to ignore the existence of the unconverted portions of the human race, or to place them below the level of the irrational creatures, and the materials of which the earth and its productions are composed.

We will now consider the author's third proposition. Having assumed that the apostle's statements referred to the earth and its irrational inhabitants, he proceeds to give his own notions of that state of vanity to which they are subjected, and nothing can better shew the fallacy of his argument than the lame and impotent conclusion into which he is forced when he thus "condescends to particulars." He says, "Who as he gazes on

the fairer features of nature, the sunny landscape, the sheltering woods, the clustered mountains, does not feel the force of the *inscrutable antithesis*, all so fair, yet all subject to such a destiny, so beautiful, yet so doomed?" An antithesis is a figure of rhetoric, but we presume the word is here employed to indicate some former, or some future state of being; but if this antithesis be indeed *inscrutable*, we may ask, what argument, *not inscrutable*, can be founded upon it? Why should we grieve and lament about a condition of which nothing is, or can be known? "why should a man forestall his date of care, and run to meet what he would most avoid?" For aught that the author knows, and from all that we know, of the course of the Divine Providence, these creatures of his hand will for all time, in their order and degree, play their allotted parts in the vast drama of creation, just as they do, and have done ever since they were called into being. It is not, we apprehend, a subject of lamentation that the earth does not stand still upon its axis, in order that the landscape may be always sunny, nor do we see much to lament in the condition, past, present, or future, of the mountains and the woods. The woods once existed in the shape of seeds and acorns, the hills were once the sediments of seas and rivers, or molten rocks lying far below the surface, and precipitating those metals without which man must have remained so helpless. Whatever other ends they may have to answer, it is certain that they were designed by him who formed them for the uses and dominion of man, and their doom and future destiny, whatever it may be, cannot but be consistent with the original design of their Creator.

Our author goes on to tell us:—"It is not said that the creation was subject to death or corruption, though both lie involved in the expression, but to something *more frightfully generic*, to something almost worse than non-existence, to purposelessness, to an inability to realize its natural tendencies, and the ends for which it was called into being, to baffled endeavour and mocked expectation, to a blossoming and not bearing fruit, a pursuing and not attaining, yea, and as the analogies of the language of the original express, to a searching and never finding."

To the proposition thus elaborately stated, we must oppose the following objections:—On the one hand it contradicts our own daily and hourly experience; it falsifies those results which the best and most able of our race have spent their long and laborious lives to attain; it is contradicted by the testimony of the astronomer, the physiologist, and indeed of every student of natural history; and on the other hand, it is directly opposed to

many express declarations of Scripture, as well as to all inferences to be drawn from it, while not a single statement or inference can be vouched for its support. The inspired writers, it is true, seldom touch upon this or any other matter which did not come within their province. Their notices of the animate and inanimate creatures in relation to man, or otherwise, are few and casual. But whenever they *do* refer to the Divine Providence, as shewn in the arrangement and government of the material world, so far from grieving over its fancied state of vanity and imperfection, they exult in its excellence and admirable adaptations. We are expressly taught that these creatures do the work which their God and ours gave them to do; that the earth is full of his riches; that in his wisdom he has made them all; that they wait upon him, and do his pleasure; that his tender mercies are over all his works; that he commanded, and they were created; that he established them for ever, and made a decree which should not pass. If, however, we should accept our author's theory, that all created things are purposeless, and incapable of realizing the ends for which they were called into being, we should reject and despise those teachings with which such a belief is altogether inconsistent. We should dishonour him by calling that unclean which he hath cleansed; and this notwithstanding our Lord's teaching, that they are clothed and nourished and guarded by his loving kindness and care. Such a proposition is equivalent to the assertion, that the Creator's care and providence are insufficient for their support in their normal condition. Before we accept this belief, we may at least require the author to be more explicit as to the conditions of which he speaks, so far at least as they are *not inscrutable*. He admits that the material universe is both fair and fertile, and admirably adapted for the use of man; what would he have more! When he alleges that the actual condition of all creation is abnormal, distorted and degraded from its original high destiny by man's offence, he must have formed some idea of its normal and original state. He cannot mean that the trees and plants, of which he speaks so eloquently, grew with their roots in the air, or did not grow at all; that water did not flow, or that rocks and stones did; that the brutes were endowed with reason and speech; that the planets did not revolve in their orbits; and that the sun did not shine. It would, however, have been well if he had suggested what good conditions the brute and inanimate creation then had which are now wanting, what evil conditions are now present which were not present then; and we may also ask, whether it is meant that the creatures are not now sustained and preserved by the Creator,

or that they are sustained by him in a condition which he did not design for them.

It is but seldom that any notice of irrational creatures is to be met with in St. Paul's writings. His attention was fixed upon a far greater science. When, however, he does happen to refer to them (never, indeed, except for the illustration of some other proposition), what he says is consistent with other passages of Scripture to which reference has been made, as well as with the teachings of his great Master. Professor Ellicott, indeed, tells us that "the whole creation has become subject to vanity owing to the rebellion of his suzerain, and is now, as the apostle tells us, ever groaning and travailing in its alien and unnatural bondage." Not only does the apostle tell us nothing of the kind, but he says the very reverse. How can we reconcile such a notion of his teaching with the statement in his treatise on the resurrection of the body contained in the Epistle to the Corinthians? He tells them that it is God that giveth to every plant a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body; that there are celestial bodies and bodies terrestrial, that the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. That body which the apostle believed to have been both given and sustained by God himself would hardly have been regarded by him as in a state of "alien and unnatural bondage," nor can we suppose him to have been so inconsistent as to hold that those bodies terrestrial and celestial of which he spoke as *glorious* were also "purposeless, incapable of fulfilling their natural tendencies," and altogether vile and worthless, as our author describes them. And since it cannot be supposed that the apostle designed to teach one doctrine to one church, and another directly opposed to it to the other, we must accept the plain and emphatic statement in his Epistle to the Corinthians, in opposition to the very questionable and strained inferences which it is attempted to draw from that addressed to the Romans.

It will be noticed that one of the chief defects which our author finds in all created things, one of the principal symptoms and proofs of the vanity which he laments, is their *mutability*; but surely a little reflection might have satisfied him that this condition is essential to every existence other than the Supreme Being; that it is in truth *very nature*. The word itself in the original so implies. Nature is not that which is, or has been, but that which is *about to be born*. There is, in truth, no present, for while we speak or think of it, it sinks into the irrevocable past; we live but in that which is to come, and this change is the characteristic condition of all created existences,

whether material, moral, or spiritual. So far as our researches have carried us, we have ample reason for the belief that each change that has occurred since that day when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy on the completion of the new-born world, has been a preparation of that earth for the use of man; each was the blossom of some former, the bud of some future change, and that thus all were just so many processes in the making of a vast and most exquisite machine of the uses and ends of which we now see but a very small portion. But, however that may be, it is certain that there neither is, nor can be, but One unchangeable; and, therefore, to lament our own liability to change, is to lament that we are not endowed with His attributes. If it were indeed possible that either man himself, or those inferior existences of which the author speaks should be immutable, they would be, not *supernatural*, but *unnatural*; they would frustrate their Maker's intention, and lose their place in that vast procession which set forth when Time first was, which is still speeding on its way, and will ever move onward, until like a weary child returning to its mother's breast, Time shall sink to rest in the bosom of that eternity from which it sprang. It is not given to us to comprehend *why* the world should have been formed at all, and yet we do not feel ourselves at liberty to deny that it *was* made: why then should we deny that it was constituted in that particular manner in which we find it, and imagine that it was formed in some far better condition, and thus be led to lament over it, and invent theories to account for its degradation? If the whole is incomprehensible, how can we expect that the several parts which go to make up that whole should be otherwise? Surely the answer that was given to the Pharisee's carping inquiry, "Why was this man born blind?" might suffice to repress and rebuke such vain murmurs and inquiries for all time—"that the works of God might be manifest:" and we might also do well to remember our Lord's expression of thankfulness with reference to a still more mysterious dispensation—the spiritual ignorance of the wise and prudent,—“Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.”

If the author's views as to the creature of whom *St. Paul* spoke, and that condition of vanity of which he *himself* speaks, are found to be thus unwarranted, we need not be surprised to find that his statements as to the cause or influence to which the subjection to vanity is to be attributed, are both vague and inconsistent. In the first instance, as we have seen, he rejects without hesitation the opinion that this subjection to vanity was the work of Adam, asserting that we should not regard the

author of it as any other than God himself, "not by him simply and directly, but by reason of him, owing to some determination of his counsels." "Who, in accordance with the deep harmony that exists between all parts of his creation, was pleased to decree that along the cloudy paths of suffering and mutability all things should emerge together into the perfect day." This is, we apprehend, a perfectly scriptural view of the matter, since whatever influence the first man may have exercised upon the fortunes of his descendants (and some of the opinions which are entertained upon that topic are strange and wild enough), no one has ventured to affirm that his influence was that of dominion, which is implied by the word (*ὑποτάξαντα*) "subjected," and as little can it be said that he had power to subject them "in hope" of that far happier condition,—the liberty of the glory of the sons of God. Notwithstanding, however, these plain assertions that this subjection to vanity was the work of the Creator, rather than the creature,—when the author a little farther on comes to treat of the *period* at which this subjection took place, he finds occasion to revert to the *cause* of it, and abandoning the statement first made, he intimates that it was not, "as some of the popular thinkers of our own day would fain persuade us, in consequence of some primal law that reaches back into the furthestmost region of the past, and was originally designed to include both us and all mankind in the necessities of a common bondage, but as our own hearts already half tell us, and the guarded language of our present text seems not obscurely to indicate, *not* the original law, but a counter-law, a judicial dispensation which opposition to the will of a beneficent Creator, served to call forth and to ratify." And again, "Let us doubt not that the sin of man wrought all the ruin that we can now trace, both in nature and ourselves."

We shall not pause to inquire what distinction can be drawn between a law and a counter-law, as ordained by Him whose counsels can know no change, nor how any law of his needs ratification, or can be ratified by opposition to his will; but we may reasonably ask how our hearts can enable us to extract from the apostle's expressions a meaning which our understandings must unhesitatingly reject. So far from not obscurely indicating the law or dispensation to which subjection is to be attributed, there is not in the whole passage one single expression or allusion relating to it, much less connecting it with Adam or his offence. For anything that is here stated, the subjection in question might as well be attributed to the fallen angels as to our first parent, and if St. Paul says nothing about him, we are at a loss to conceive how or why, consistently with

the canons laid down by Dean Ellicott himself, or with any other sound rules of interpretation, he should be introduced upon the scene, except, indeed, upon the principle that has always more or less prevailed in scholastic theology, that everything in nature that cannot be otherwise understood may safely be referred to the first man and his disobedience, "*Omne ignotum pro Adamico.*"

Not only is the view stated by the author, as to the cause of the supposed condition of vanity in the earth and its brute inhabitants, unwarranted by Scripture, it is entirely opposed to all those inferences that can reasonably be deduced from Scripture. . From Genesis we learn that the animate and inanimate creation which stands related to man possessed before his creation those very same conditions which it now possesses, and which the author so pathetically laments; and it is described with a precision which seems designed to set at naught such speculations as those in which he indulges. The landscapes were, doubtless before Adam's time, sometimes obscured by clouds and darkness. The mountains then, as now, were either raised by subterraneous movements, or worn down by chemical and mechanical forces. We know that the earth brought forth grass, that the herbs yielded seed, that the trees bore their fruit with its seed; the earth required tillage, and was refreshed with moisture; the rivers flowed through and enriched the land; the waters teemed with fish; the earth was furnished with beasts, and the air with fowls, which were nourished by the green herbs; and all these in their turn were placed under the dominion of man. And since the case with all these things is at this day exactly what it then was, where are we to look for the evidence, that the sin of man has brought them to a state of ruin and degradation? where do we find the traces of the bar sinister?

If ever it could be said that the animate and inanimate creatures were subjected to a condition of vanity, it would be during the period that *preceded* man's appearance upon earth, when it was without form and void. Both Scripture and our daily experience abundantly testify that the destiny of the creatures, animate and inanimate, was to the use of man. They were given to him, and he was to have dominion over them; and although we cannot hold with Dean Ellicott, that this or any other of the divine works ever was or could be in the state which he describes—unable to realize its natural tendencies, and the ends for which it was called into being, it may be admitted that in a certain *very qualified* sense it was so. But that was long before the date assigned by him; it was in fact only while he for whose

dominion and use the creatures were designed had not appeared to claim his rich inheritance. If the Dean's argument be well founded, it would follow, that before they fulfilled their Maker's design, they were *not* in a state of subjection to vanity; and now that they are effectually fulfilling that design, they are subjected to something more than perishableness, and worse than decay! Would that the author had profited by Kingsley's remark, "that the way to God's kingdom of heaven does not lie through the slander of His kingdom of earth."

We apprehend it to be clear, that unless we resort to the too common practice of importing our theology into Scripture, instead of taking it from Scripture, our hearts will not enable us to arrive at the result at which our author has arrived; but even then, it would be at variance with the author's own statement. The subjection to vanity, he says, is in accordance with the "deep harmony that pervades creation;" if so, what influence can Adam's offence have exercised, if it has not impaired that harmony? Even if we should accept the Supralapsarian dogma, that his sin was decreed from all eternity, we should be no nearer the solution of this difficulty, since He who decrees the means, decrees also the end for which the means are decreed; and thus Adam's share in the transaction can never be regarded as an efficient cause, but simply as a mode employed by a far higher agency to work out his designs. We cannot recognize in this, or any other transaction, two efficient agencies, either of which must exclude and supersede the other.

Let us take another instance of the difficulties into which the author is forced by his attempts to reconcile a questionable dogma of the scholastic theology with the teachings of Scripture, and the researches of science. While he maintains that the offence of Adam has exercised an influence so blighting and degrading upon the irrational and material creatures, he yet describes them as existing before that offence, exactly in the condition in which we now find them. Indeed, so inconsistent is his statement in this respect with the rest of his discourse, that we cannot refrain from suspecting that it was extracted from some other essay or sermon, written, as the lawyers would say, "*alio intuitu*." Thus he says:—

"Prior to that time (the fall of man) all nature was lovingly obeying the laws impressed on it by God; the herb was yielding its seed, the animal was bringing forth its kind, each to be succeeded by a more numerous growth of its own species, or to make way for more highly-organized types of animal or vegetable life. Decay meant reproduction, dissolution development, death a return into the general life of nature, which was to be succeeded by a more prolific emergence. All was obeying the beneficent

laws of the Creator; everything was tending in its own measure and degree to a final perfection, and if the speculation be not over bold, to a final annihilation of any evil that might have flowed as a consequence from the fall of angels, by those very fore-ordered processes to which *we*, in our ignorance, give the names of incompleteness and imperfection."

Now, leaving all speculation as to the evil which might have flowed from the fall of angels, as being both "over bold" and irrelevant, we may reasonably inquire, in what respect the conditions here indicated, as existing before "the fall," differ from those which have fortunately survived that event; and we must also protest against the statement, that in these days any one, unless indeed it be the Dean himself, is disposed to give to those fore-ordered processes of which he speaks, the names of incompleteness and imperfection. We believe that somehow or other nature *does* obey those laws which are impressed upon it by God, for without them it would not be nature; unless we are strangely deceived; the herb *does* still yield its seed, the animal brings forth its kind—each is succeeded by a more numerous growth, or makes way for more highly organized types; and since these are admitted to have been the normal and primitive condition of these creatures, we are utterly at a loss to conceive what is meant by the assertion, that they are now, by means of the first man's fault, in an abnormal and degraded condition, unable to realize their natural tendencies, and the ends for which they were called into being.

There is yet another aspect under which the subject may be viewed; viz., how far it is reconcileable with our notions of the supreme justice as derived from Scripture. The Dean regards the brute and inanimate creation as blameless, and yet suffering, and thus as deserving the pity which he lavishes upon them. As if like *Circe's* "rabble rout," they were rational creatures expiating under some strange and fantastic disguise some former folly or offence, not indeed their own but another's. If indeed we could do so much violence to religion and common sense, as so to regard them, we should be tempted to inquire, how far it was consistent with the declarations of Scripture, that infinite justice should thus visit the offence of the rational creature upon the irrational. We should require some far better answer than the author has given to his own question:—"Is the attribute of preserver to be denied to the Creator, or given only under such limitations as make it a very mockery and a bitterness?"

If Scripture teaches us that amongst creatures of the *same* race, there is an individual responsibility, "that God renders to every man according to *his* work;" "that every man shall bear *his* own burthen;" "that the dead were judged out of those

things that were written in the book, according to *their* works ;” “ that every one may receive the things done in the body according to what *he* hath done, whether it be good or bad ;” and again, that “ the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son : the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him ;” can we conclude that this canon which God has pronounced by the lips of his prophet, as a proof that his ways are equal, is to apply between individuals of the same race, and yet that the brute and senseless earth is to be supposed not only capable of enduring punishment, but as actually punished for a disobedient act of the first of the human race ?

We cannot close these remarks without adverting to the uncandid manner in which the argument is conducted. From so eminent a writer, it might have received better treatment. Surely it is not by such methods that the right interpretation of Scripture is to be vindicated, or the faith of Christian men aided. We allude not merely to the language in which the author’s propositions are couched, so obscure and involved, that, like the clouds which opportunely received Homer’s deities whenever they seemed likely to come to grief, it seems designed to shield the author from hostile criticism. This is, to a certain extent, imposed upon him by necessity, since none but the most vague terms would suffice to describe a condition which he himself states to be inscrutable. No necessity, however, can justify the introduction of inconsistent and contradictory propositions, several of which have already been noticed, and many others might be pointed out. We chiefly complain, however, of the manner in which the author deals with other commentators, both ancient and modern. Thus he tells us, that the more sober and thoughtful commentators of the present day are plainly converging to a common interpretation of this mysterious passage, and are distinctly tending to reaffirm the ancient and traditional interpretation of the early Church ; and that after most anxious consideration, he cannot doubt that Irenæus and the Greek fathers were right in giving to the term “ creation ” the meaning for which he himself contends ; and, when speaking of St. Augustine’s opinion, that this term was to be confined to mankind in their unconverted state, he says, his own words shew that he here receded from his usual expansive interpretation of Scripture under the pressure of Manichæan antagonism. After the “ most anxious consideration ” we have been able to give to the subject, these statements appear entirely unfounded. We have seen that the few lines from Irenæus, upon which the author relies, when

read in their context, will not support the inference which it is attempted to draw from them, and he quotes no other authority from the Fathers, nor can any be quoted in support of his assertion, that this was the ancient and traditional doctrine of the Church. Of the multitude of sober and thoughtful interpreters of the present day, he instances one (Usteri) who has retracted his former opinion, that *κτίσις* was to be limited to mankind; and although he mentions the opinions held by several other modern commentators, he admits that, so far from converging to a common interpretation, some of them stretch the reference *too wide*, and others *unduly limit* it. The summary manner in which he deals with the Fathers, and indeed in which they are usually dealt with on those occasions, is amusing enough. If their opinions happen to agree with those of the writer, they are treated with the utmost consideration; but if not, they are pushed aside without ceremony.

Thus Origen and St. Augustine happen pretty nearly to coincide in opinion upon this text; both regarding the creature here meant, as a rational creature, and (St. Augustine) ridiculing the contrary belief. Considering that these are the two greatest authorities of their respective churches, it was important to get rid of so formidable an obstacle. Nothing however is easier: Origen, it seems, is to be set aside because his interpretation is evidently somewhat subordinated to "preconceived speculations on the corruptibility of the corporeal;" and Augustine is to be disregarded because his own words shew that he misinterpreted the Scripture, under the influence of Manichæan antagonism. This seems to us a very irreverent and unfilial method of dealing with the Fathers. So far from being aware that antagonism to the Manichæan, or to any other heresy, is likely to lead men to misinterpret the Scriptures, or recede from their usual method, we should have expected that it would have had just the opposite influence. Neither does it seem to us, that St. Augustine did in fact depart from his usual expansive interpretation, or that he was under pressure of any kind; certainly, *his own words* give no such indication. He was not engaged in any controversy; he was writing a treatise on the Epistle to the Romans, and he casually observes, that a certain opinion to which he objects was an error of the Manichæans; that opinion being, that trees and herbs and stones were capable of grief and lamentation. A Manichæan indeed might well complain that such an absurdity should be imputed to him; but surely no one but a Manichæan is aggrieved, nor is the weight of St. Augustine's authority lessened by his alluding (rightly or wrongly) to them, as holding this belief. If St. Augustine and Origen are

both to be condemned on such grounds as these, then every opinion which Dr. Ellicott has himself advanced might, with equal justice, be rejected; for he certainly is not without "some preconceived speculations on the corruptibility of the corporeal;" and as we have seen, singular enough they are; and although we do not know that he is swayed by Manichæan antagonism, he may be under the influence of impressions and feelings just as likely to lead to error.

We are glad to find that the author has not, in these discourses, adopted a practice, which is not unusual with some writers of the present day, and one to which he has himself resorted on other occasions, and particularly in the concluding passages of his essay on "Scripture and its Interpretation," contained in the *Aids to Faith*. We mean the expression of earnest hopes, and sometimes even prayers, for the enlightenment of those whose opinions are not in accordance with those of the writer. Christian charity is an excellent virtue, but, like other good things, it may chance to be ill bestowed; the tone which might well become an inspired apostle should not lightly be arrogated by an uninspired divine. We are hardly justified in lavishing upon those from whom we differ in opinion, those expressions of compassion or indignation which are justly called forth by the contemplation of men's vicious lives or infidel tenets. We should regard it as a very unseemly proceeding if a chemist or astronomer, engaged in discussing some question connected with his science, should presume to express his pity for his antagonist, and we cannot but regard such a method as equally unbecoming in a critical inquiry. Men may err as well in laying down rules of interpretation as in applying them; but these, like any other errors of the judgment, may be corrected by means of reflection, of argument, and with the aid of discourses written by learned deans and professors. If so, surely as it is needless, so it is hardly becoming or reverent, to invoke the divine aid upon such an occasion. In theological discussion, as in all others, it is important to bear in mind the well-worn precept—

"Nec Deus intersit, nisi nodus vindice dignus."

THE ATONEMENT IN RELATION TO HEBREWS IX. 16—18.

It would seem that, unless some new element be introduced into the controversy on the subject of the Atonement, that controversy will be an endless one. The Bishop of Gloucester restates the doctrine of the Atonement in the *Aids to Faith* in perhaps the most satisfactory manner in which it has hitherto been stated; yet some of the most important of Professor Jowett's arguments, especially those drawn from the apparently rhetorical and even apparently inconsistent language of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are simply left unnoticed. Here, then, on the one hand we have Professor Jowett admitting that there is a mystery in the life of Christ; that is to say, that there is more than we know or are perhaps capable of knowing, and saying that "More than this is meant; and more than human speech can tell," yet cutting down root and branch the whole tree of doctrine, which we have from our childhood been taught to venerate; on the other hand, the Bishop of Gloucester upholds the received and, in our opinion, orthodox doctrine; yet he furnishes no intelligible explanation of the language of the epistle, which professes to deal directly, and not by way of assumption or passing allusion, with this momentous subject. We cannot even come to a satisfactory conclusion as to whether the book, which contains the records of our Lord and his disciples, ought to be called the Scriptures of the New Testament or the New Covenant. The Bishop of Gloucester speaks uniformly of Christianity as a new covenant, but we doubt very much whether he can justify his language, although we are disposed to agree with him in it. There is, therefore, clearly room for the introduction of some new element into the controversy from the Scriptures; for from no other quarter can Christians be expected to receive it, even though hints and illustrations be obtained elsewhere.

When the Bishop of Gloucester tells us that our Lord speaks of his blood as that of the new covenant, we turn to our Bibles, and find that in the authorized version he is made to speak not of the blood of a "new covenant," but of that of a "New Testament." It is easy enough to reply here, that the expression "blood of a testament" is an absurdity, while that of a covenant refers us at once to the ratification of a covenant by sacrifice, and that the very idea of a will or testament is unknown throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, and was probably unknown to the Jews in our Lord's earthly lifetime. But the

advocates of the expression "testament," though unable to refute these arguments, yet turn with triumph to another passage in the Scriptures, which is plainly a commentary on these words of our Lord, and challenge their opponents to produce a satisfactory explanation of it, which shall involve the word "covenant" instead of "testament." It is quite true, that the word "testament" comes out of the context, as regards the passage itself, and still more as regards the contest of the passage, no better than the word "covenant;" but that does not matter to those who desire simply the maintenance of the *status quo*, and require their views to be accepted on simple authority. In short, each party is fully able to prove its opponents wrong, but neither party is able to make out its own case to the satisfaction of a reasonable bystander. Of this passage (Heb. ix. 16, 17) neither party can make sense, and therefore neither party can extract a revelation from it; it does not however therefore follow that there is nothing in it, as Professor Jowett would have us believe.

And we must not consider, because we are accustomed to this controversy between the terms "covenant" and "testament," that it is a matter of small importance, whether the dispensation under which we live be designated by the one term or the other as its symbolical appellation. The controversy shews that our knowledge of our religion, however sufficient for the salvation of the individual, is not perfect.

But before we can fairly bring forward the new element which we propose to introduce, we must take a more detailed view of the present state of the argument.

If we look at the authorized version of this passage, we find it running as follows:—

"Ver. 15. And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of [the] eternal inheritance. 16. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. 17. For a testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. 18. Whereupon (wherefore) neither the first testament was dedicated without blood."

Here the word *διαθήκη* is uniformly translated by "testament," neither can we find any serious fault in the rendering of the Greek into the English idiom except (1), that the word *φέρεσθαι* in verse 16 is translated by "be," or, in other words, that it is reduced to a simple copula, without any force or signification of its own, which is unexampled; and (2) that

the word *βεβαία*, in verse 17, does not mean “of force,” but “certain,” “fixed,” “reliable.”

But the grand objection is in the context. For there is no pretence whatever for calling the Mosaic dispensation a testament at all, seeing that the idea of a will or testament is not to be found in the Jewish Scriptures, and has no connexion whatever with that of sacrifice, which is immediately afterwards applied to it. The translation of *διαθήκη* by testament, which is good classical Greek, must therefore be rejected, and reference be made to the LXX. version, which uniformly uses *διαθήκη* as the Greek equivalent for *ברית*, a covenant.

But here fresh difficulties meet us. Simply replacing “testament” by “covenant,” the passage will run as follows:—

“And for this cause he is the mediator of the new covenant, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the old covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a covenant is, there must also of necessity be the death of the covenantor. For a covenant is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all whilst the covenantor liveth. Wherefore neither the first covenant was dedicated without blood.”

It is, therefore, proposed to consider man as the covenantor, whose symbolical death in his representative Christ is necessary to the validity of the covenant made with God. But under this view it is soon seen that the whole passage is simply a flight of rhetoric. What need could there be for the Son of God to die in order that the Omnipotent might be assured of the permanency of the covenant made with him by the human race? This explanation assumes to such an extent the air of a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole passage, that few, if any, commentators worth notice have given in their adhesion to it.

Again, keeping the word “covenant” instead of “testament,” it is proposed to translate *τοῦ διαθεμένου* in verse 16, by *the mediating victim*, Christ being the mediating victim as well as mediating priest, through whom the covenant was made and ratified between God and man. This would give a fair sense, were it not for the statement in verse 17, that a covenant “is never strong, when the mediating victim is alive.” It would seem thence, that a covenant could be prevented from taking effect by keeping alive a certain victim called the “mediating victim.” But the most serious objection to this interpretation is, (1) that “a mediating victim” would rather be *τὸ διαθέμενον* than *ὁ διαθέμενος*, and (2) that there is no authority whatever in any grammar, lexicon, or writer, Greek or Hebrew, for such an interpretation, or for such an assumed principle of law. Al-

though it can boast many respectable names in its favour, it must be rejected by every one who has regard to his grammar and lexicon, according to which ὁ διαθέμενος can in such a connexion mean nothing but the "testator" or the "covenantor."

But let us return for a moment and consider what the argument of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews really is. He has described the son of God as a mediating priest between God and man, and he now proceeds to describe him as a victim. And first of all as a sin offering on the part of man, in whom man suffered a symbolical death, in order to be clear of previous transgressions, that "the called might receive the promise of the Eternal inheritance." Now comes the difficulty. Let us suppose that God is the διαθέμενος, or covenantor, who wishes to guarantee in a manner in which it is "impossible that he should lie," the permanency of the new covenant. "For where there is a covenant, there needs must be brought in, or brought to bear, φέρεσθαι, the (or a) death of the covenantor. For a covenant over corpses is certain, since it is never valid when the covenantor is living."

Here we have a general sentiment that the death, in some sense or other, of the covenantor is necessary to the permanency and reliableness of his covenant. And the expression ἐπὶ νεκροῖς, "over corpses," to which we may either supply ἱεροῖς or τοῖς διαθεμένοις, leads us to the idea of making a covenant "with sacrifice" (Ps. l. 5), the victims representing the parties to the covenant, and the deaths of the parties being "brought in" or "brought to bear" by the deaths of the victims. Now what idea or principle of sacrifice is involved in these details? Evidently that the death of a representative victim is taken as that of the offerer, who suffers a symbolical death in it. Thus God, in giving his Son to die for man, did not merely give him to stand for man in his death as a sin offering, but also to stand for himself, the Father, as a federal or covenantal offering.

The passage is thus quite clear. Christ, both God and man, stands for both God and man in his death. He dies for man, that man, suffering a symbolical death in him, may be clean to approach God; he dies for God, that God, suffering a symbolical death in him according to the primary idea of sacrifice may give the most solemn guarantee imaginable to the human race of His intention to establish a permanent and immutable covenant with them.

Thus we arrive inductively at a primary idea of sacrifice, which we must now *try* upon the various phenomena that present themselves in connexion with sacrifice. Let us apply it to the

explanation of the first sacrifices on record,—those of Cain and Abel.

Man appears, from the preceding history in the Book of Genesis, to have lain under sentence of death, which seems, on repentance, to have been commuted for a life of toil and sorrow. Coeval with this appears the institution of sacrifice. Applying our primary idea of sacrifice, we say that man in his then state could only approach God through death, but that he was mercifully allowed to approach him through a representative victim, the death of which victim was, *pro hac vice*, mercifully taken as his own. After such a death, and before he had polluted himself by fresh sin, he was able to approach his Maker acceptably. Abel approached God with, Cain without, a victim. Abel thus suffered a symbolical death as a sinful being under sentence of death, before he ventured to approach his Creator, and was accepted: Cain approached God as a living and reasonable being, who had a right to approach Him, expecting his gifts to be received as of right, and was consequently rejected.

Second, comes the sacrifice of Noah, after leaving the ark. By sacrifice Noah acknowledged the preservation of himself and his family, suffering a symbolical death in the victims in acknowledgment of having been preserved from a real death, and thus entering into a new state of life.

Thirdly, we have the remarkable sacrifice offered by Abraham, and the consequent covenant made by God (recorded in Gen. xv. 7—18). Here, apparently, Abraham approached God after first suffering a symbolical death in his sin offerings. God then took to himself the death of the same victims, in respect of his covenant with Abraham, and to guarantee its unchangeable nature, by passing between the pieces of the victims under the symbols of a smoking furnace and a burning lamp, which appear to have prefigured the cloudy pillar by day and fire by night, which guided and guarded the Israelites on their escape from Egypt.

But it may be objected to this view, that the ancients considered that the deaths of the victims in case of a covenant were rather symbolical of the fate that should overtake the perjured violator of the covenant, than of a death suffered by the parties at the time. For this purpose a passage—the only passage bearing upon the subject in the whole range of classical literature—is quoted from Livy (i., xxiv.), where the *fecialis* prays that, if the Roman people is the first to violate the engagement made with the Albans, Jupiter will strike it as he himself strikes the swine, which is the ratifying victim of the covenant.

But not to mention that the authority of Livy on historical

and antiquarian points of that date is not very valuable, it is singular that a somewhat similar curse should be attached in Homer to *pouring out the wine*, not to the death of the victim.

“ Ζεῦ κύδιστε, μέγιστε, καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,
 Ὅππότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὄρκια πημήνεια,
 Ὡδέ σφ’ ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέοι, ὥς ὅδε οἶνος,
 Αὐτῶν, καὶ τεκέων· ἄλοχοι δ’ ἄλλοισι μιγεῖεν.”^a—*Il.* iii., 300.

Neither is the imprecation uttered by any one officially employed, but by the spectators:—

“ Ὡδε δέ τις εἶπεςκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε.”

Hence we should infer, that this imprecation was not *à priori* connected with the primary idea of sacrifice as applied to a covenant, but was an *à posteriori* application of some one or other of its ceremonies in particular cases.

There is also a passage in Jeremiah xxiv. 18—20, to which a similar remark will apply:—“And I will give the men, that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant, which they made before me, when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof the princes of Judah and the princes of Jerusalem, the eunuchs and all the people of the land, which passed between the parts of the calf: I will even give them into the hands of their enemies, and into the hands of them that seek their life, and their dead bodies shall be for meat unto the fowls of the heaven and to the beasts of the earth.”

No more solemn method of inaugurating a covenant with God could be imagined, than for the authorities of a whole nation thus to suffer a symbolical death to their old sinful state, and enter upon a new life by passing between the pieces of a representative victim. And if the explanation derived from Livy be applicable here, which it may be, although there is no allusion to any such imprecation, it certainly does not apply nearly so well as that which we uphold, to the sacrifice in Genesis xv., in which not men, but God is the covenantor. Neither do the two explanations at all interfere with each other, the one being the *à priori* idea, the other the *à posteriori* application of the

^a Thus rendered by Cowper:—

“ All glorious Jove, and ye the pow’rs of Heaven,
 Whoso shall violate this contract first,
 So be their blood, their children’s and their own,
 Pour’d out, as this libation on the ground,
 And let their wives bring forth to other men.”

covenantal sacrifice, in cases in which such an application was possible.

Fourthly, the sacrifice of the ram instead of Isaac, in Gen. xxii., is clearly treated in Heb. xi. 19, as a symbolical death on the part of Isaac. It is there said, that Abraham received him from the dead *ἐν παραβολῇ* in a figure, *i.e.* after suffering a symbolical death in the substituted ram. Such, we find, is also the view of the passage taken by Dean Alford.

Fifthly, we come to the passover. Here the explanation is very obvious and easy. A lamb was taken for every family, representing the first-born of that family. The first-born of the Egyptians suffered a real death in their own proper persons; those of the Israelites a symbolical death in the substituted lambs.

Sixthly, we have the dedication of the first covenant (Exod. xxiv. 3—8), “not without blood,” (Heb. ix. 18). Moses here acted as a *μεσίτης*, or mediator, between God and the people. The altar, probably with the book of the law upon it, stood on God’s part, the people stood for themselves. Moses sprinkled both parties to the covenant with the blood, indicating that both suffered a symbolical death in the sacrificed victims, and that the covenant was thenceforth unchangeable.

Seventhly, the sacrifices at consecrating the priests (Exod. xxix.), evidently betoken a symbolical death on the part of Aaron and his sons, who suffered in their representative victims, before they could be admitted to approach God on behalf of the people.

Eighthly, there is no reason why the same theory should not apply to the daily morning and evening sacrifices, as regards the people generally, though in an inferior degree as compared with those of the great day of expiation.

Ninthly, this idea appears very vividly in the sin and trespass offerings of individuals, wherein the offender manifestly suffers a symbolical death in respect of his fault, and begins a new life, as a new man, in respect of it afterwards.

Lastly, the grand sacrifice of expiation on the great day of atonement involved a symbolical death on the part of the priest, before he was allowed to act as such for the people; and a symbolical death on the part of the people collectively, after which the whole nation began a new life, to have a similar symbolical end the next year. The sins, with respect to which they had suffered this symbolical death, were put upon the head of the scape-goat, and with him removed to a distant region.

Let us now turn to heathen sacrifices, which will be very useful in illustrating our theory. There were two modes by which the homicide averted the penalty of blood for blood. One was

by servitude; and here Müller^b remarks, that "the circumstance that the Æchalian chieftain Eurytus, the father of the slain Iphitus, receives the money paid for the redemption of the slayer (Hercules), is a plain indication that the servitude represents a surrender of the life [of the slayer]." "The other mode consists in the substitution of a victim, symbolically denoting the surrender of the man's own life. . . . But in expiation for blood, we find among the old Greeks the widely-diffused rite, whereby the ram represents the human being; as the goat among the Jews, so the ram among the Greeks and kindred Italic races was the principal peace (sin?) offering. The very ancient Minyan legends concerning the Athamantiades, which have been so profoundly investigated in later times, turn entirely upon the human sacrifice demanded by the wrathful Zeus Laphystios, and the ram substituted in its place. A ram is the principal offering at all oracles of the dead, the ceremonies of which closely agree with those of expiation for blood; their object usually was to pacify the souls beneath the earth. Black rams and sheep were the customary sacrifices to the dead in Greece. Now it was a very ancient Roman usage, and as we are told upon the occasion, an Athenian usage also, that in a case of unintentional homicide (*si telum fugit magis quam jecit*), a ram, as a vicarial substitute for the head of the slain, was given (*aries subjiciebatur*) to the Agnati or ἀγχιωτεῖς, on whom the duty of avenging blood immediately devolved. This was one of the peace-offerings on the return of the homicide, which are denoted by the term ὁσιόωσθαι, and are distinguished from the καθάρσθαι, the rites of purification. "For the head of the *slain*," say our authorities; for which we would put "the head of the *slayer*." For, as is shewn by the legends concerning the race of Athamas, which was preserved from the sacrificial death by the substitution of a ram, this animal as a sin-offering takes the place of man, even in cases where there was no slain to be appeased. Besides, it would be very strange if the slain, whose Erinnys is the chief thing to be pacified, received a brute victim, as the vicarial representative of his own life. On the contrary, it is clear that the ram was given for the man's life, precisely as in the usage before explained, the ransom paid over to the family of the slayer, as the price of the slayer, represented the slayer."

Now with all this we fully agree; and it was the observation of the discrepancy between these statements and the view taken by the same writer of the "sacrificial procedures used with oath-takings and covenants; in which the slaying and dismembering

^b On the Eumenides of Æschylus. *Hilasmoi and Katharmoi*.

of the victim has always been understood as a symbol of the fate which shall overtake the perjured," that led us to consider whether, after all, the sacrificial ceremonies used at covenants—those at oath-takings seem to have been rather an afterthought, than a primeval institution, for oaths *and* sacrifices were the two grand modes of assurance—were not reducible to the same primary idea of the victim representing the man *at the time*, which Müller so well develops with regard to sin-offerings. Passing then to the passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is the principal subject of this article, we found that our theory solved its difficulties in a moment, besides accounting for a great many other things, which had hitherto been unintelligible or obscure.

The guilty person, when a sin or trespass-offering was offered and the homicide, in Greece, did not die a symbolical death in the representative victim in all respects, but merely with respect to the particular sin, or trespass, or act of homicide in question, and with regard to that only, was he considered as a new man. So, upon the same principle of *representation*, not *substitution*, in sacrifices ratifying covenants and treaties, the contracting party or parties must have been considered as dying *in respect of the treaty or covenant* in the sacrificed victim or victims, and thus retaining no power of changing their minds in respect of that particular treaty or covenant. Thus God binds himself to Abraham through a sacrifice in Gen. xv. 17, and by passing symbolically between the pieces of the victims, declares himself to have suffered a symbolical death in them in respect of his covenant and promise, which is thenceforth unalterable, although the further security of an oath is afterwards given in Gen. xxii. 16.

It is also necessary to remark, that our Lord was not only the *μεσίτης*, or Mediator; but also the *ἔγγυος*, or surety of the new and better covenant (Heb. vii. 22). And where can a more deep and solemn explanation of our Lord's suretyship be found than here? How much better this is than from classical Greek to drag in a notion of *διαθήκη* which is unknown to the LXX., and which takes this difficult passage entirely out of relation with its context! How much better than to defy the grammar and lexicon, and persist in translating *ὁ διαθέμενος* *the mediating victim*! How much better too than to reduce the whole of this serious passage to an account of the mode in which man binds himself to God! Surely it is God who guarantees the permanence of the gospel covenant, not man, who either thankfully accepts or ungratefully rejects the promises and the guarantees voluntarily entered into with him by his Maker?

No other theory of sacrifice, especially as connected with

covenants, has been found, which offers a solution of the difficulties of the Epistle to the Hebrews; is there not therefore a fair probability that this is either the right theory or a considerable approximation to it? If our data are wrong, it is impossible that we can expect men of equal or superior abilities to accept our deductions. It is for want of the true theory of sacrifice that Jowett, Maurice, and others now appear to be attacking that vital doctrine of Christianity, the Atonement. But it is not really the doctrine of the Atonement that they have been attacking, but some one or other of the various approximations to it, that men have, from time to time, been permitted to make. The objections that they bring forward have simply no basis, and no existence, when brought before the doctrine as inductively deduced from Scripture. No question arises here about God's justice, in punishing the innocent instead of the guilty; no difficulties arise on the subject of satisfaction. All is mercy, but mercy worked out according to a plan fixed at the beginning, shewing itself in the first institution of sacrifice, appearing from time to time in the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, and finally assuming transcendent greatness in the culminating sacrifice of the death of Christ, a golden thread running through the records of generations and ages, till it is time for it to be gathered up into a ladder to reach from earth to heaven.

Several other passages of Scripture, which have not as yet, yielded to any commentator, fly open at once at the touch of this magic wand. Gal. ii. 19, *διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον*, *By the law I died to the law*, is explained in an instant. By the regular rule of death in a representative victim acknowledged by the Mosaic law, I died to that very law:—"I have been crucified with Christ." So too Rom. vi. 7, where *ὁ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, *He that has died stands justified from his sin*, is put as the basis upon which St. Paul raises the superstructure of our baptismal death in Christ. With the exception of this final reason of the whole, the passage is clear enough. But it is strange how commentators invariably fly off at a tangent to disquisitions on the mysterious connexion of sin and death, which neither they themselves nor any one else can understand, and the very obscurity of which is as inviting to many minds, as it is undoubtedly repulsive to others of really a higher order. Upon the representative theory of sacrifice, the passage is clear enough. He who has suffered a death in a representative victim stands justified from the sin, with respect to which he has suffered such a symbolical death. We have suffered such a death in baptism to our former sinful state; how can we any more

live in sin, with which we have thus formally broken our connexion?

There is still another passage, which has always been reckoned among the greatest difficulties in the Epistle to the Hebrews, if not in the whole of Scripture, and which has never yet been explained satisfactorily, though it yields at once to the application of the idea that, as a covenant is between two parties, if broken, it must be renewed by *both* parties, and not merely by one of them only, unless special provision has been made for such a one-sided renewal. That passage is the celebrated one in Heb. vi. 4—6, which appears to indicate, under some circumstances or other, an impossibility of restoration to God's favour under the gospel covenant. As translated in the Authorized Version it runs :—"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." But this will require to be considered at length.

Just stopping to notice that the position of *καλὸν* "good," and the change of case after *γευσάμενους*, from the genitive to the accusative in the original, indicate that *καλὸν* is rather a predicate than an epithet of *ρῆμα*, we would observe, that the word "them" after "renew," in the Authorised Version, is probably reflexive (= "themselves"), as in the last answer in the Catechism, "repent them truly of their former sins," the collect for the second Sunday after Easter, "endeavour ourselves to follow," (?) the exhortation in the communion service, "repent you truly for your sins past," etc. Thus our translators will be in agreement with the Fathers, who unanimously treat the accusative cases preceding *ἀνακαινίζειν* as subjective, rather than with Beza and most of the modern commentators, who treat them as objective.

The fact, that Origen takes these accusative cases as subjective, appears to us of great importance, as his education was Hellenistic; Chrysostom, on the other hand, who takes the same view, is a less important witness, as his education, like our own, was purely classical. Tertullian takes the same view as Origen, a fact which testifies to the current acceptation of the passage at an early period. Origen paraphrases *ἀνακαινίζειν* in his Greek commentary on St. John (tom. xx., 12) by *ἀνακαινίζειν ἑαυτὸν*, and in the old Latin translation of his commentary on St. Matthew, we find the same word represented by *renovari*, which points rather to *ἀνακαινίζεσθαι* than *ἀνακαινίζειν ἑαυτὸν*, in the

lost Greek original. There is also a remarkable various reading in the Greek text of Origen on St. John, which gives ἀνακαίνισμὸν ποιεῖν ἑαυτῶν, instead of ἀνακαίνιζεν ἑαυτὸν. In Leopold's text of Tertullian, *renovari* should certainly be substituted for *revocari*. Chrysostom paraphrastically has ἀνακαίνισθῆναι. The inference hence drawn by the Fathers is that baptism cannot, under any pretence, be repeated; thus confining the sense of the passage to the renewal of the covenant made by man with God, without any reference to that made by God with man.

This interpretation and the deductions drawn from it are rightly rejected on both exegetical and grammatical grounds, by most modern commentators, who see plainly enough that the question of the iteration of baptism is an utterly insufficient element in so grave a passage as the one under consideration. They endeavour to mend the matter, by taking the accusative cases in question as objective, and translate so as to involve the statement that "it is impossible to renew unto repentance advanced Christians, who fall into some grievous error or apostacy denoted by παραπесόντας." Thus this passage is a millstone around the neck of many grievous sinners, who believe that these words, thus explained, preclude them from the possibility of repentance.

Against the modern interpretation we should advance two objections:—1. That the ear of the old commentators led them to take the accusative cases preceding ἀνακαίνιζεν as subjective rather than objective. 2. To whom is it "impossible to renew them unto repentance?" To man or to God? If to man, is not the whole passage solemn trifling and the dullest truism? If to God, is it not flat blasphemy to attribute such an impossibility to Him, with whom all things are possible—except to lie? And is it not worse than trifling to say that "impossible" only means "very difficult?"

Let us now return to the view of the old commentators, which, in our opinion, contains truth, though by no means the whole truth. It appears to us that they were simply led astray by the faulty analysis of the ancient grammarians, who considered that a transitive verb was used intransitively, by the omission of the reflexive pronoun, and that thus ἀνακαίνιζεν = ἀνακαίνιζεν ἑαυτοῦς = ἀνακαίνιζεσθαι. In condemning this, we so far go along with Dean Alford, whose name ought never to be mentioned without respect by students of the Scriptures of the new covenant, even when they are opposing what they believe to be his errors. But we cannot go along with him, in considering it an impossibility that ἀνακαίνιζεν should be used intransitively. We think that we can easily supply the law of

such an intransitive use of transitive verbs; and, also, that the interpretation which will result from this, combined with the considerations mentioned above, will be found of a much higher nature than the mere reference to the non-iteration of baptism of the old commentators. We think, in fact, that the habit of supplying the reflexive pronoun to a transitive verb used intransitively is the thing, and the only thing, that has misled the old commentators exegetically as well as grammatically.

Let us now proceed to the enunciation of the grammatical law, which we have observed to prevail in the intransitive use of transitive verbs in collocations, in which no direct object appears, and even in cases in which none can be supplied, which we scarcely think will be found to be the fact in the present instance. It is this:—

Any transitive verb can be used to express the simple performance of the action denoted by it, without the mention of any object, upon which it is to act.

Thus in Aristophanes, *Equites*, 349:—

ὕδωρ τε πίνων ἀπιδεικνὺς τοὺς φίλους τ' ἀνῶν
ᾧου δυνατὸς εἶναι λέγειν

ἐπιδεικνὺς simply means “making a display,” without reference to what is displayed.

Again, in the *Laches* of Plato, 183 B, we have:—οὐκ ἔξωθεν κύκλῳ ἐπιδεικνύμενος περιέρχεται, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς δεῦρο φέρεται καὶ τοῖσδ' ἐπιδείκνυσιν; where the middle ἐπιδεικνύμενος points to the person in question, making a display of *himself*, and the active ἐπιδείκνυσιν to his making a display, no matter of whom or what.

Again, in Plato's *Apology*, p. 41 c, we have οὐ δῆπου τούτου γε ἔνεκα οἱ ἐκεῖ ἀποκτείνουσιν=“I feel sure that those in the next world do not inflict death for this fault,” without any mention of the persons on whom death is inflicted.

Again, in Livy (v., 1) we have:—“Ita muniebant, ut ancipitia munimenta essent.” Here *Castra* is usually supplied after “muniebant.” But this is unnecessary. “Ita muniebant”=“They so fortified (*i.e.* constructed their works), that their fortifications faced both ways.” Also, v. 12:—“Tribuni plebis de tributo remiserunt”=“The tribunes slackened as regards the tributum,” where the intransitive use of the Latin and English words correspond.

Instances in the New Testament are the right readings; πληρώσωσι in Rev. vi. 11, οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, without ἑαυτοὺς in Jude 19; and ἐθέράπευσε in Luke xiii. 14.

Madvig, in his Latin grammar, § 94, expresses the law,

which we have given above, in different words, and gives as an instance, *amo*, "I am in love," without reference to any object of love. Jelf, in his Greek grammar, 359, 4, explodes the common notion, that the personal (he should have said *reflexive*) pronoun or some substantive is to be supplied, but does not give any law by which the usage is regulated. He gives, however, a long list of such verbs, not including those which we have mentioned above, but including *ἀνακοντίζειν*, *ἀφανίζειν*, and *σφακελίζειν*, which exactly correspond in form to *ἀνακαινίζειν*.

Dr. Donaldson, in that Greek grammar, which stamps him as the first of English—no longer alas! of living—grammarians, goes further still, and says, § 430:—"Although it is the custom to place the transitive before the intransitive verb in the active form, there can be no doubt that, in the active, as in the passive inflexion, the intransitive usage is anterior to the transitive, which is merely a causative or secondary signification, and requires an objective case as a secondary predication to complete it. The anomalies of signification, which have been briefly mentioned above (336—350) shew that even after the transitive use had become the common and established signification, there was a tendency to fall back on the neuter, or independent construction. . . . The true theory of syntax, according to which every oblique case represents an adverbial or secondary predication, renders it necessary to consider every verb, even of the active form, as having been originally neuter or independent."

But, for our own part, if we were called upon to supply a direct object for *ἀνακαινίζειν* in this passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we should unhesitatingly supply *τὴν διαθήκην*. And in defence of this we should quote not only Heb. x. 20, *ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν*; but also Heb. ix. 18, *ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη (ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ) χωρὶς αἵματος ἔΓΚΕΚΑΙΝΙΣΤΑΙ*, where no one doubts the propriety of supplying *διαθήκη* to *ἡ πρώτη*. For it is pretty plain that *ἀνακαινίζειν* would be properly used to denote the reperformance of the action denoted by *ἐγκαινίζειν*. And if *ἡ διαθήκη* is a proper subject for the passive *ἐγκεκαίνισται*, it is surely a proper object—whether expressed or not—for the active *ἀνακαινίζειν*.

We think too that the following illustration from our own language will go far towards bearing us out in so doing. It is the custom in England for policies of insurance to be renewed by half-yearly payments, and if the payment be not made within a certain time, then the person insuring is no longer able *ἀνακαινίζειν*, TO RENEW. To renew what? His policy of insurance. Thus advanced Christians, who deliberately and voluntarily

(ἐκουσίως, Heb. x. 26) apostatize, and take up another religion instead of the Christian covenant, are represented in this passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as unable to RENEW. To renew what? Their covenant with God? Why so? Because there are two parties to a covenant, and if broken, it must be renewed by both of them, unless there is special provision for its renewal by one only. There is no such special provision in the Christian covenant, therefore it cannot be renewed by man, nor could it be renewed by the iteration of baptism, the theory of the non-iteration of which is thus true, as far as it goes. But it must be renewed by God as well as man. And it will not be renewed by God, because it would require the recrucifixion of Christ and repetition of His shame and sufferings, whereby God made his new covenant with man according to the explanation we have proposed of Heb. vi. 17, 18.

For baptism is not the making of the covenant, which was made upon the cross on God's part as well as on that of man; it is merely the authorized mode of the individual man's entrance into it. Apostates of the class described in this passage may repent, but cannot make their covenant with God anew; they are thrown in fact upon the *uncovenanted* mercies of God. For that covenant consists of an act on God's part as well as on that of man, and God does not a second time offer His Son for crucifixion.

But we must provide a suitable sense for εἰς μετάνοιαν, before our explanation of this passage is complete. We might say: (1) That they cannot enter into a state of repentance acceptable to God for Christ's sake by renewing their covenant; or (2) remembering εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, in Acts vii. 53, and μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, in Matt. xii. 41, we might translate "they cannot renew their covenant *upon* repentance," as the Ninevites repented, according to our version, *at* or *upon* the preaching of Jonah. Or (3) we might understand εἰς more strictly both here and in Matt. xii. 41, as = "in the direction of," "according to" repentance in the one case, and "the preaching of Jonah" in the other. Any one of these three will give us a satisfactory sense in the passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews under consideration, so little effect have other matters besides the grand points of the intransitive use of ἀνακαινίζειν, and the necessity of the renewal of the covenant on God's part as well as on that of man, upon the explanation of the passage.

There is no difficulty in the expression πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν, as we find a similar passage in Aristoph., *Eq.*, 1099:—

καὶ νῦν ἐμαντόν ἐπιτρέπω σοι τουτονὶ
γερονταγωγεῖν κάνα παιδεύειν πάλιν.

But the word *ἀνασταυροῦντας* presents a little difficulty at first sight. The regular word signifying to crucify in the Scriptures of the new covenant is *σταυρόω*, and *ἀνασταυρόω* would thus naturally mean to re-crucify or crucify again. But *ἀνασταυρόω* is commonly used by other writers in the simple sense of “crucify.” This might cast a doubt upon our interpretation, were it not for the following word *ἐαυτοῖς*, which limits the sense of *ἀνασταυροῦντας* to a private act of crucifixion “for themselves,” as opposed to the grand crucifixion of the Son of God, which took place once for all on Mount Calvary.

We therefore translate the passage under consideration as follows:—

“For it is impossible for those who have once been illuminated, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted that good is the word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and have fallen away [by apostacy], to RENEW on repentance [or in the direction of repentance, *their covenant with God*,] by [re-] crucifying for themselves the Son of God and making him a public spectacle.”

This explanation also brings the passage into complete accordance with Heb. x. 26—31. What could remain to apostates thus unable to re-enter into covenant with God, and finding no more sacrifice for sins remaining, but a fearful expectation of judgment and a burning anxiety, which they must dread would eventually devour them in the flames of hell? “A terrible thing (x. 31) is the falling (*unprotected by a covenant*) into the hands of the living God.” It is not so to the true believer, who falls asleep with his hope full of immortality. But to such apostates as have voluntarily forsaken their covenant, it must be indeed a terrible thing. Such persons may eventually by God’s *uncovenanted* mercy be saved; but they cannot in this life enjoy any assurance of their salvation. Somewhat similar is St. Paul’s declaration (Gal. v. 2) to his Galatian converts; that if they persisted in receiving circumcision, in addition to their profession of Christianity, “Christ would profit them nothing.”

It must be remembered, too, that the class thus contemplated must ordinarily be a small one, consisting, as it does, of only those *advanced* Christians, who apostatize *voluntarily*, *ἐκούσως* (Heb. x. 36). The early Church was certainly right in taking the more merciful view, and re-admitting to communion, after probation, those who had lapsed *ἀκούσως*, involuntarily, from physical terror in time of persecution. They were surely not guilty of *such* an apostacy as is contemplated in these two awful passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

We have endeavoured to shew in another place^c what space will not allow us to go through here, that the two immutable things of Heb. vi. 18, are (1) the oath of God; (2) the covenant made as described in Heb. ix. 16—18, according to our explanation. Thus all the principal enigmas of the Epistle to the Hebrews are solved, and are all found to revolve around a common centre.

Finally, let us return to the passage primarily under discussion, and paraphrase it at length, shewing how simple and how clear it is, when taken to pieces and put together again with the missing element supplied.

“ And therefore it is that Christ is the mediator, both as mediating priest and ratifying victim, of a new covenant between God and man, in order that, his death having taken place as a sin-offering on the part of man, for the redemption and release of the transgressions committed under the old covenant, thus clearing away any obstacle in the way of the transition from the old to the new, those called to live under the new covenant may receive the promise now of the eternal inheritance hereafter. And this death of Christ is not merely a sin-offering on the part of man, but also a federal sacrifice in addition to the oath of God, as a pledge and security that God, by symbolically dying in Him, His representative victim, as well as that of man, has guaranteed that he will not alter the terms of salvation freely offered under the new or gospel covenant. For, as we see in both Jewish and Gentile treaties and covenants made with sacrifice, where there is a treaty or covenant, which is to be rendered certain and unchangeable, a death on the part of the maker of the covenant must be brought to bear symbolically in that of his representative victim. For a covenant made over the corpses of sacrificed victims representing the contracting parties, is certain and sure; since, unless such a symbolical death has been suffered, it is never stable, strong and unchangeable, as long as the maker of the covenant, who has otherwise not given full security against a change of mind, is living.”

We commend these thoughts and reasonings to the serious consideration of our brethren, fully believing that we are not inviting them to spend their time and labour in vain. In a former number (that for April, 1861), we endeavoured to shew the bearing of this passage thus explained, upon the system of Professor Jowett; and we have now attempted to discuss both it and others more or less connected with it at length, in the hope that some one will be found to make up our deficiencies, and develope the germs of vital truth, which we are firmly persuaded lie hidden in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

A. H. W.

^c In the Dissertation “God’s Death in Christ,” in *Barabbas the Scapegoat and other Sermons and Dissertations*. By A. H. Wratishaw. J. W. Parker and Son.

THE TREE OF LIFE.

THE notion of a tree of life as furnishing, in the divine economy of the spiritual man, the required nourishment of immortal souls in Paradise, existed among the Egyptians from the earliest period to which their religious monuments can be traced.

Rosellini, in his great work on Egypt,^a has a scene in Paradise, taken from a tomb at Thebes, in which several generations of a distinguished Egyptian family who flourished under the eighteenth dynasty up to the time of Ramses III., are represented partaking of this immortal nourishment, the fruit of the tree of life, and receiving also the living water of life proceeding from the same divine source.

The paradise here intended is the state or place of departed righteous souls, who, according to the Egyptian theology, as explained in the works of Rosellini, Wilkinson, Lepsius, Brugsch, Birch, and Emmanuel de Rougè, have triumphed over evil through the power of Osiris, whose name they bear, and are now set down for ever in his heavenly kingdom. Osiris was venerated as the incarnation of the goodness of the Deity, and, according to the last-mentioned authority, was universally worshipped in Egypt, as the Redeemer of souls, 2000 years before Christ.

The head of this family was named Poèr, and the members of it are shewn seated in two rows on thrones, one below the other; each is receiving from the tree of life, or rather from the divine influence residing in the tree, and personified as a vivifying agent under the figure of the goddess Nutpe or Netpe, a stream of the life-giving water, and at the same time an offering of its fruit.

The tree is the *figus-sycamorus*, the sycamore tree of the Bible, and it stands on a sort of aquarium, symbolical of the sacred Nile, the life-supporting agent of the land of Egypt. Within this are various fishes that inhabit its waters, certain plants that grow on the surface, and birds that fly above, while the lotus is seen on its banks, and a heron, the symbol of the first transformation of the soul in the paradise of Osiris, stands on each side.

The tree is abundantly productive, and from the upper part of it, among the branches, the goddess Netpe rises with a tray of its fruit in one hand, and with the other pours from a vase streams of its life-giving water.

^a *Monumenti Civili*, vol. iii., p. 456, No. cxxxiv.

This water is represented by parallel zigzag lines, similar to a well known architectural moulding frequently seen over the door-heads of Saxon and early Norman churches, and which was no doubt originally there introduced as symbolical of the water of baptism, the initiatory sacrament of the Church, and at one time figuratively called its gate or door, *janua ecclesiæ*.

The Egyptians had also a baptism by water, or a sacred function of a similar kind, administered to adults; it is occasionally seen represented on tablets where two priests, or divine personifications, standing one on each side of a royal personage, pour over his head streams of water from vases held in their hands: there is a fragment of a large tablet in the Egyptian Museum of the Vatican, on which this is seen, and where the water is not represented by parallel zigzag lines merely, but by a series of the *cruz ansata* joined together in a zigzag manner.

The *cruz ansata*, it is well known, was the symbol of life among the Egyptians, and is here introduced, the subject being on a scale sufficiently large to admit of it, to signify the life-giving properties of this water. In the great work of Lepsius will be found a similar representation. The parallel zigzag lines are an abbreviation of the larger and more complete symbol.

In the gospel of St. John we read of our Lord making a distinction between ordinary water and the water which he should give of eternal life.

Thus (John iv. 13, 14) in reference to the water of the well of Samaria, Jesus says, "Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst: but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

What our Lord meant by this water of everlasting life is obvious, from various passages of Scripture. Thus in John vii. 37, we read:—"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come into me and drink." When Christ said to Peter, "Will ye also go away?" that apostle replied, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

So that the living water was the doctrine of eternal life, which they who believed in Christ should receive.

The living water in the Egyptian theology would appear to have signified the same thing; it was in their doctrine the symbolical support of eternal life to all who received it, along with the fruit of the tree of life which grew in the paradise of Osiris.

In the subject on the tomb at Thebes given by Rosellini, the departed are represented as in their living bodily forms; but the

symbolical figure of a disembodied soul, a sparrow hawk with a human head, is added to distinguish between the present life and the future. A sparrow hawk with a human head was the conventional manner of shewing the separated soul, especially during the later dynasties, and at the Greek period.

The first figure in the upper row, and immediately facing the tree of life, is that of Poèr, for whom, with his family, this tomb was prepared; behind him sits his father, then his mother, whose person has been almost obliterated along with the other figures on this line.

On the line below are seated his ancestors, his grandfather, grandmother, etc., as explained by the parallel columns of hieroglyphics which occupy the background.

Rosellini considered the goddess Netpe to be a form of the Egyptian Rhea, the sister and wife of Sev (or Saturn), and consequently, in mythological language, mother of all those gods or divine emanations of an inferior order, having an especial relation to our human nature, and presiding over mundane affairs. Her hieroglyphical name is "Abyss of Heaven," and she would here seem to personify the heavenly influence exercised on the living soul in supporting its immortality through her ministration; hence in the mythological language of later times, she may be said to have been the mother of an order of gods, understanding by that expression mortals raised to immortality by receiving the doctrine of eternal life. (See John x. 34, 35.)

In the museum of Egyptian antiquities at Berlin are three stele, or sepulchral tablets, on which the doctrine symbolized under the figure of the tree of life, and the divine sustenance which it affords, are represented at three periods of Egyptian history widely separated from each other.

In the earliest of these, which Dr. Lepsius found in the village of Abousir, near the great pyramids, the tree of life is represented by the palm tree, the *Phœnix dactylifera*: from the upper part of the stem proceed two arms, one of which presents to the kneeling figure of a deceased person a tray of fruits, the other pours from a vase a stream of water which the deceased receives in his hand, and thus conveys to his mouth. The tablet has been broken, so that very little is seen of the figure which was behind this: beneath the tree are two herons feeding from triangles, or possibly they may be intended for the ibis. The equilateral triangle is a well known symbol of the triune deity. The heron was sacred to Osiris, and was, as already remarked, symbolical of the first transformation of the soul in its passage through the heavenly mansions. The ibis was sacred to Thoth, the personified principle of divine wisdom, and the record-

ing spirit in the judgment day of departed souls before the awful tribunal of Osiris. The period of this stele would appear to be anterior to the fifteenth century B.C.

In the second of these three stele, which belonged to the original collection in the museum known as that of Koller, the tree of life is the sycamore tree (*ficus-sycamorus*); it has two incisions in its stem, such as are usually made in this tree for procuring fruit of a pleasant flavour, as the juice is exceedingly bitter (see Jerome upon Amos viii. 14), though, according to Hasselquist, these wounds are made because the inhabitants believe that without them the tree would not bear fruit. From the upper part of the tree rises the bust of a female figure, Netpe the goddess of the heavenly life, administering to the deceased the water of life, and the fruit, or, as it would seem, the bread of life, for three round substances like rolls are here represented, and are so described by Dr. Brugsch. The deceased kneels before Osiris, the saviour and judge of the dead among the ancient Egyptians; behind his throne stand Horus and Isis with her sister Nepthis.

Osiris wears the usual winged cap (*Atf*), and holds the flail and the shepherd's crook, the symbols of his chastening and pastoral office in the care of souls. The deceased presents to him, on an altar, a lotus flower as the symbol of the new birth (de Rougè), and of inexhaustible life (Lepsius); it is held over a vase of water, possibly to signify the symbolical source of regeneration.

On the opposite side of the tree kneels a female figure, the sister of the deceased, who is also receiving the water of the tree of life.

It is not known where this stele was found; Dr. Lepsius, in a letter which he wrote to me on the subject, considered it to be of the period of the nineteenth dynasty, or about the time of Ramses II., 1400 B.C. The style of it shews that it is later than the former one.

In the third stele, the tree of life, as a tree, has disappeared, and in its place we have a whole length figure of the goddess Netpe, with her hieroglyphical name, "the Abyss of Heaven;" she is surrounded by a triple row of leaves, somewhat of an oval form, and suggestive of the glory around the persons of the Blessed Trinity, and of the Virgin Mary in Christian iconography; in fact, but for the evidence afforded of their meaning in the earlier examples, it might be supposed that these leaves were intended for an areola of pedunculated flames.

The female character of Netpe, as a nourishing and supporting personified principle, is prominently marked, and she is per-

forming the same function as in the other stele, and in the painting on the tomb at Thebes.

The soul of the deceased has the conventional bird-like form with a human head, and is presenting an offering of fruit and flowers to Osiris, who is here divested of his Egyptian characters, and sits like a Greek emperor or magistrate; behind him stands a female figure, having on her head an ostrich feather, the symbol of truth, along with a conventional form of the palm tree. This figure is the personification, or goddess, of the west, or, as she is sometimes called, of the happy west, possibly in reference to the heavenly kingdom of Osiris; she often appears in the hall of truth at the great scene of the final judgment.

This stele was obtained by Dr. Lepsius, at Cairo; he considers it to be of the period of the Ptolemies. It is evidently of the Greek epoch, if not later; the pure Egyptian style has disappeared, although the doctrine remains the same, but is not so simply expressed. We here see that what was originally a tree, with a pair of arms, has been changed into a whole figure by progressive stages; the symbol has become transformed into an idol, and thereby the primitive simplicity of the doctrine deteriorated in the manner of its representation.

In the earliest of these three stele in the Berlin Museum, it is worthy of notice that the sacred tree, the tree of life, should be represented by the date palm—*Phœnix dactylifera*. From the period assigned by Dr. Lepsius to the second and less ancient stele, it is extremely probable that the first, judging by its style alone, cannot be later than the fifteenth century B.C., about the middle of which the Pentateuch is believed by many to have been written; and taking into consideration the greater simplicity of representation in reference to doctrine, may be much older.

The date palm was at one time the sacred tree of lower Egypt, and represents, phonetically, surmounted with the ostrich feather, the land of the west, or the happy west, as such it occurs on the zodiac of Dendera. But, as a symbolical and sacred tree, its meaning was more recondite.

There is no tribe of trees so useful and important to man as the palm tribe, none which furnishes him with so many necessities of life, or whose growth is more beautiful and majestic, and of all the palms, that which from primitive times, and in the primeval seat of our race, has been the most prized, and regarded as indicative of the divine beneficence, is the date palm.

Among the Jews, the date palm would seem to have had a certain typical signification; it was largely introduced in the decorations of Solomon's temple, being represented on the walls

along with the cherubim, and also on the furniture and vessels of the temple (1 Kings vi. 29, 32, 35 ; vii. 36).

In the song of Solomon, which theologians regard as significant of the love of the Church for Christ, the spouse of the Church is spoken of as the palm tree. "I said, I will go up to the palm tree, I will take hold of the boughs thereof" (Solom. Song viii. 8).

The palm tree is also in Scripture a favourite *simile* for the righteous, who are said to flourish as a palm tree.

In the last chapter of the Apocalypse there is a reference to the palm tree, as the tree of life in the heavenly Jerusalem. St. John thus describes the water of life and the tree of life : "And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bear twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month ; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations" (Rev. xxii. 1, 2).

The palm tree was popularly believed to put forth a shoot every month, and hence became, at the close of the year, a symbol of it ; and was the origin of the Christmas tree, so popular with the Germans, but derived originally from Egypt. The Evangelist would also seem to signify, that this tree of life was the gospel tree of redemption, of which the twelve apostles were the exponents, and their healing doctrine its leaves. It is well known that the leaves of the palm tree were, at one time, used for writing on (Pliny). How far the house of the Lord which Solomon built was intended to prefigure the heavenly paradise with trees of righteousness and cherubim, may be a matter of opinion ; but it would certainly appear that the palm tree was at this time, and most probably had been ever since the Exodus, regarded by the Jews as the most sacred of trees, and held to be typical of the tree of life in its most recondite meaning.

The palm tree, together with the persico (peach tree), occur in later representations of the paradise of Osiris, along with the Christian symbols of blessed souls, doves and peacocks.^b

In Christian symbolism the tree of life is the date palm, and souls are represented commonly as doves, more rarely as peacocks.

In the Apsides of the Roman Basilicæ we frequently see the

^b There was a fresco of this subject on the wall of a small atrium at Pompeii, in a house near the gate ; in 1812 Francisco Morelli made a drawing from it ; an engraving from it, of which the author possesses a copy, was published at Naples in 1833. The sacred heron occurs along with the doves and peacocks, and in the distance are the islands of the blessed.

date palm in mosaic work on each side of a group of figures, consisting of the Saviour seated between the four evangelists or other saints ; and on one of these palm trees is very commonly perched a phoenix with a glory of rays. There is a good example of this in the Church Sts. Cosma e Damiano ; the phoenix with the glory symbolizes the resurrection to eternal life, and is placed on the palm tree as the symbolical support of that life. Occasionally, a palm tree is placed between each pair of holy persons figured on these apsidal.

In the Church of St. John Lateran, at Rome, there is represented in the apsis a sacred mound, from the sides of which flow four streams, the rivers of paradise, or the four gospel streams of living water. Within this mound, as seen in section, is an enclosure, with an entrance to it, guarded by an angel holding a drawn sword ; behind him, and in the centre of the enclosure, is a palm tree, and on it is perched a phoenix with a glory of rays. At one side of the tree stands a venerable old man, on the other side a younger one, each has a glory ; these figures are intended for the Father and the Son, and the palm tree between them is the tree of life in the midst of the garden.

On the top of the mound, and planted in the fountain of the water from whence the four streams gush forth, is a lofty, articulated, and gemmed cross, bathed in beams of light from the radiant body of a dove, the Holy Ghost, hovering over it.

What the tree of life was to the first covenanted man in the primitive paradise, the cross planted on the hill of paradise is thus shewn to be to the second, with this difference, that the tree, after the fall, was no longer accessible to man in his state of condemnation, and is represented fenced about and guarded from the world as a sacred mystery ; but the cross is free to all, placed upon a hill, and resplendent in light.

Frequently, instead of a cross on the mound of paradise, there is the figure of a lamb, as Christ, bearing a cross, with the twelve apostles, as sheep standing on each side. In Christian iconography, Christ and the cross are regarded as having the same meaning.

That the divine source of life in Christ was considered identical with that which was in the tree of life, the symbolical palm tree, is well shewn by the illuminated frontispiece to an Evangelium in the library of the British Museum, ascribed to the eighth century, but probably somewhat later.

In this the symbols of the four evangelists, the angel, the winged lion, the ox, and the eagle, placed over four columns of lessons from their gospels, are shewn looking up to a palm

tree, which rises from the centre over the columns, bearing flowers and fruit.

In the stem of this tree are two incisions, as on the stem of the sycamore tree in the second of the Egyptian stele, and on the top of the tree is planted a cross, having suspended from its arms the Greek letters Alpha and Omega. The incisions in the stem have probably an intended reference to the wounds of Christ, and the tree and the cross evidently signify the same thing—Christ the tree of eternal life to all who come unto him.

As the tree of eternal life, Christ furnishes to faithful souls the food of immortality.

This is the subject most frequently found symbolized on early Christian sepulchral tablets and monuments—even on the rudest of them, shewing how universal was this sentiment. There is a series of these in the *Musée Lapidaire* at Lyons.

Departed Christian souls, as before remarked, are usually symbolized as doves, more rarely as peacocks.

In St. Clemente at Rome, in the Apsis, is a cross of mosaic, on which are represented twelve doves, these signifying the twelve apostles united to, or having their life in Christ. On a sarcophagus in the Museum of the Lateran are two doves on a cross, surmounted by the monogram of Christ within a wreath. In the Museo Archivescovile at Ravenna, there is a sarcophagus bearing the monogram of Christ, the diagonal cross with the Greek rho, and a peacock and a palm tree on each side.

M. Comarmond, the conservateur of the Museum at Lyons, states in his illustrated catalogue that the figure of a peacock more rarely accompanies Christian inscriptions than the figure of a dove; and remarks that S. Augustin affirms the Christians considered it as a symbol of the resurrection of the body, because the flesh of it was thought to be incorruptible.

In one of the compartments of a very interesting ivory tabernacle in the sacristy of the cathedral at Sens, of about the eleventh or twelfth century, two peacocks are figured as the souls of Christian saints, having each a palm branch attached to its neck, between them is placed a pine cone. In the cathedral of Vienne in Dauphinè, I have seen a sarcophagus of the same period, on which are represented two peacocks feeding on the bunches of grapes that grow upon a vine planted in a sacramental vase.

On the tablets in the Museum of Lyons, however, the birds are simply birds; they have no distinctive character, and the trees are simply trees, very rude scratches—a tree is placed between two birds; but on some of these tablets, instead of a

tree, there is an equally rude monogram of Christ with birds pecking at it.

Occasionally, but this is rare, the griffin takes the place of the peacock. On a tablet in St. Mark's at Venice, of which a cast is in the Crystal Palace, and another in the Architectural Museum at South Kensington, two griffins are represented feeding on a vine that grows in a tripartite form out of a vase, and that there might be no mistake what this vase is meant to contain,—the Eucharistic wine,—the Thyrsus is placed within it. The fact of the pine cone taking the place of the cross and of the tree of life, shews the universal character of Christian symbolism, and its oriental origin. On our Nineveh monuments, pine cones are held in the hands of the winged figures standing beside the sacred tree of the Assyrians, a conventional form of the palm tree, and surrounded by an enclosure of palmettes; the pine cones are held towards the tree, as having a significant connexion with it. The pine cone in the hands of the Assyrian figures is synonymous with the crux-ansata in the hands of the Egyptians, and is presented by them in the same way.^c

On the baptismal font of Winchester Cathedral, believed to be of the eleventh century, two doves are represented approaching to drink out of a vase, in which is planted a jewelled cross; here the cross takes the place of the Thyrsus in the tablet at Venice. On the same font are also two doves pecking at a bunch of grapes—faithful souls feeding on Christ.

Our blessed Lord called himself the vine; the juice of the fruit of the vine was his mystical blood, and the fruit would therefore represent his body. But our Lord declared his body to be also the bread of life, of which whosoever eateth should live for ever; this also has given rise to symbolical representations of the bread of life, as small round rolls or cakes with a cross upon them; we may see such on tablets in the Christian museum of the Vatican, and occasionally also on sarcophagi.

In the Lateran museum there is a sarcophagus on which sheep are represented as feeding on certain round, ring-shaped substances, resembling those breads which in Italy are called *ciambelli*, and which are no doubt intended for such; and that it might be evident what these breads mean, that they are the fruit of the tree of life, of the symbolical palm tree, one of them is placed on the top of a palm tree, rudely represented at the side. In the cathedral of Ravenna there is a sarcophagus on which the meaning of these round, ring-shaped breads is also shewn, both in reference to our Lord and to the palm tree.

^c *Bononi's Nineveh* (Bohn) p. 158.

Christ, without a glory, is seated between two disciples, who present on a corporas, spread over their hands, two of these breads, significant of the support of life without end; beyond them are two palm trees.

Among the Gentiles, the palm branch was an emblem of victory—it is given to Christian martyrs as significant of their triumph in the faith, and their victory over death; but there is another motive for this, it shews their relation to Christ, the captain of their salvation, their tree of life, their symbolical palm tree. In virtue of this relation, they become, in figurative language, trees of righteousness, and have sometimes been thus represented. Bosio, in his *Roma Sotteranea*, gives an engraving of a sarcophagus on which two human figures are planted as trees, their trunks being surmounted with the foliage of the palm tree. Christ, the cross, the tree of life, and the palm tree are thus identified in meaning. In tree crosses they became identified also in form; these however were of later introduction. Agincourt has an engraving of one of the fifteenth century, or a little earlier—it was taken from a fresco which he found on the wall of an old convent near St. Agnese, beyond the walls of Rome. In this subject Christ is nailed to a tree, apparently intended for a palm tree, or the conventional form of one. This, and probably all tree crosses, may have a reference to that beautiful religious fable, not without a meaning, which was current in the middle ages, that the cross of Christ had been made from the wood of a tree originally a slip cut from the tree of life, and which, by the favour of the angel who guarded it, Seth was privileged to plant in the world. This legend is related by M. Didron.

In a previous essay^d it has been shewn, that sacred trees are met with among all ancient nations, from China to Scandinavia—the palm, the sycamore, the fig tree, the oak, the ash, and some others which might be mentioned; a divine influence was believed to be present about them; in some instances God himself was imagined to inhabit them, and they were held in devout veneration or worshipped with religious awe.

In the “tree of life” of the Egyptians, we have perhaps the earliest, certainly the most complete and consistent, representation of this most ancient and seemingly universal symbol. The “tree of life” in the midst of the Paradise of God furnishing the divine support of immortality.

And what does this tree mean? The Scripture explains it. “Man,” saith our Lord, “doth not live by bread alone, but by

^d See *J. S. L.*, July, 1862, p. 273.

every *word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Here we have a key to the symbolical teaching, itself symbolically explained. The divine word is the support of the divine life; they who partake of it shall never die. "Whoso receiveth me and my *word*," saith the Lord, "I will raise him up again at the last day." We have the authority of St. Augustine, that the Egyptians firmly believed in a resurrection from the dead, and their historical monuments shew that they did so, at least during one period of their highly-civilized career.

The "bread of life," and the fruit of the "tree of life," and the "water of life," are all significant of one and the same thing—the divine nourishment of the soul unto everlasting life. And this primitive doctrine, which has never changed, is, it would seem, dimly, yet not always obscurely, traceable among the Gentile nations in the religious associations of ideas symbolized by their sacred trees.*

H. C. BARLOW, M.D.

* Errata in the article on "Sacred Trees" in *J. S. L.* for July, 1862.

p. 274, line 20 from bottom, after "underwent," transpose the word "changes."

p. 275, line 15 from bottom, *delete* the comma after "energy."
 line 14, for "noons," read *Norns*.
 line 9, for "noons," read *Norns*.

p. 281, line 1 of note, for "Hesiol," read *Hescol*.

p. 282, line 15, insert *when* after "prevailed."

p. 283, line 3 from bottom, for "fevered," read *fervid*.

p. 287, line 5, for "transfiguration," read *transmigration*.

p. 288, line 11 from bottom, for "name," read *own*.

p. 289, line 17 from bottom, for "for," read *from*.

p. 290, line 7, for "uniformity," read *conformity*.



THE SYRIAC LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

THE object of the present article is not to tell the students of the Syriac language and literature anything which they do not already know. Its aim will be to speak intelligibly to such as are interested in the subject, but have not studied it. To these it may afford a little information in a department still, alas! familiar to but a few; and it is hoped that something may be said which will persuade or induce some who read to examine more minutely a field which invites new labourers, and promises them a meet reward. There are three or four classes especially who will not fail to be recompensed by the study of Syriac literature; and we will say who they are, and why it is so. The Syriac language has many affinities with Hebrew, and a competent knowledge of it will greatly aid in the understanding of many words and idioms in the Hebrew Bible. This is an advantage which flows directly from a mere acquaintance with grammar and lexicon. If, however, the use of Syriac is valuable to the Hebrew student, it is, perhaps, even more so to the New Testament critic. The Greek of the New Testament is largely influenced by Aramaic or Syriac idioms, and its text contains a number of untranslated Syriac words and expressions. Besides this, the versions of the Scriptures in Syriac are of great importance to the explanation of many obscure passages, and the settling of many doubtful readings. It is not too much to say, perhaps, that an acquaintance with the Syriac language and versions is essential to the critic and the expositor of the Greek and Hebrew texts.

Those who wish to devote themselves to patristic literature, and to become acquainted with rare and precious theological treatises left by the early Church, should study Syriac, which contains a rich treasure of large extent. Those also who turn their attention to ancient liturgies, may find in this language, perhaps in their oldest forms, a considerable number of liturgical works. The same is true of hymnology. There are many Syriac hymns which will exceed in antiquity almost anything in Greek and Latin, and which go back at least to the times of Ephræm Syrus. With regard to the canons and decrees of councils, too, we may say that there are no manuscripts so ancient as some of those in Syriac, containing notices and decisions of some of the earliest councils. These canons and the creeds, which sometimes accompany them, are of peculiar interest, and often present readings of much importance. Nor will the student of ecclesiastical history be disappointed, for he will meet with some

authors in Syriac who are otherwise unknown or not extant; and of extant historians he will find noticeable variations. The literature of the language is chiefly Christian; but there are some remains of classic lore, and translations or treatises of more or less interest to the philosopher and others. Such being the case, it is surely a thing to be desired that those who have the time and the talent should draw more or less freely from this venerable fountain, and impart to others what they obtain. Having said so much, we shall proceed to fulfil the promise which we have made.

The Syriac language was not merely spoken in Syria. We shall find that it was known in provinces far asunder, and that many of the chief monuments of its literature were not written in Syriac. At the present day it exists in a modernized form on the borders of lake Oroomiah, in north-western Persia. There is reason to think that, at one time, it spread from the shores of the Mediterranean to the mountains of Kurdistan, and it was not unknown in Arabia and Egypt.

This language is one of those commonly called Shemitic, although not wholly confined to the descendants of Shem, as appears by the examples of the Phœnicians and the Abyssinians, whose lineage is connected with Ham. Most of the Shemitic dialects have a strong family resemblance, although they may be classed under several heads or divisions. Among them are the Hebrew, the Phœnician and the Chaldee, the Samaritan, Sabian and Nabatean, the Arabic, Himyarite, Ethiopic, Syriac, etc.

The Syriac is regarded as one of two great branches into which the Aramaic divides itself, viz., the eastern and the western, and hence it is sometimes called the Western Aramaic. This distinction is convenient, if not accurate, and might be used in default of a better. We shall call the two branches the Syriac and the Chaldaic. We cannot indicate the geographical limits of these languages. We have already noticed the wide spread of the Syriac, and we may remark that, under the Nestorians, it was carried by their missionaries across Mount Taurus, and penetrated as far as southern India, and to the heart of China.

Although the Shemitic tongues are so closely allied, they were represented by several alphabets. These alphabets in all likelihood had a common origin for the most part, and are therefore connected with those of Greece and Rome, which may have been carried by Phœnician traders to the west, and there modified in the lapse of time. The rise, growth, and offshoots of these alphabets is a subject of curiosity, but cannot now be investigated here. Neither can we point out the characteristic

differences of the Shemitic alphabet, either as regards the number, the forms, or the powers of the letters.

It has been frequently said that the Syriac and Chaldee only differ from one another in the characters employed. This is true of many individual words, but it is decidedly incorrect as it regards the languages. A single reference to the Chaldee portions of the Old Testament will prove what we say. The reader will perceive at a glance that these portions are not merely transcribed, but as truly translated in the Syriac, as any other parts of the Bible.

We sometimes hear the question asked, When and where did the Syriac language first make its appearance? This is not an unnatural enquiry, but it is one more easily suggested than resolved. Adhering as we do to the historical character of the Book of Genesis, we have no hesitation in saying that some seventeen centuries before Christ, Laban the Syrian spoke a dialect which differed from that of Jacob; for in Genesis xxxi. 47 we are informed that Laban called the "heap of witness," *Jegar Sahadutha*. These words may certainly be either Syriac or Chaldee, according to the vowels employed. Jacob called it *Gal-eed* (which is Hebrew). Now, the "*Jegar Sahadutha*" of Laban shews that, at that very remote period, the difference of the Aramean from the Hebrew was marked and distinct; but whether a later dialectic divergence gave rise to what we call Syriac, it is probably hopeless to enquire. The earliest unquestioned monuments of this language now extant are nearly or quite all posterior to the Christian era; and all those which are written appear to have proceeded from the pens of Christian writers. True, it is a common and long established tradition among the Syrians themselves, that some portions of the Old Testament were translated as early as the time of Solomon. This cannot, however, apply with any truth to the present well-known Syriac version called the *Peschito*, which bears many traces of a later and, indeed, of a Christian age. It should, perhaps, be remarked, while speaking of ancient traces of the language, that the inscriptions of *Taiba* and of *Palmyra*, although in a peculiar character, have been shewn to be in an almost pure Syriac. The oldest of these inscriptions is referred to about A.D. 49, and the most recent to about A.D. 258.

The Syriac language seems to have early exhibited several variations. Thus Bayer, in his *Historia Osrohena et Edessena*, says:—"There were three dialects of the Syriac tongue, as Gregorius Bar Hebræus Malatiensis tells us: 1. The more elegant Aramean, which prevailed at Edessa, at Carrhæ, and in Mesopotamia. 2. That of Palestine, and of the inhabitants of Damas-

cus and Lebanon. And 3. The more corrupt and impure, spoken among the Chaldean Nabateans, the mountaineers of Assyria, and the pagans of Arech." In the opinion of Ernest Renan, "we ought to look for the origin of Syriac literature in Chaldea, and that this literature is nothing but the continuation of the Nabatean," which was pagan in its source and general character, as this was Christian. Moses of Khorene professes to quote the work of a certain Mar Abbas Catina, who wrote the annals of Armenia in Greek and Syriac 150 years before Christ: but it is palpable that no reliance can be placed upon this statement, because Mar Abbas Catina is a Christian title. By general consent of scholars, the oldest monument of the language in a literary form is the venerable translation of the Scriptures, known as the Peshito,^a containing the Old Testament from the Hebrew, and the New Testament from the Greek. For a number of reasons, we regard both the Old and New Testaments as translated by Christians. We cannot pretend to say exactly when it was executed. It was regarded as ancient in the time of Ephræm Syrus, who flourished in the middle of the fourth century. We have read the greater part of this translation, both in the Old Testament and in the New, and should be disposed to say that internal evidence would suggest it to have been the work of different times; although the variations it exhibits could be accounted for by supposing that the version was made by different persons or in different places. In all probability this venerable version was, for the most part, made not much later than the end of the first or the middle of the second century after Christ, which is long before the appearance of any other version of the entire Bible now extant.^b Two or three curious references bearing upon this subject, and professedly of the second century, exist. One is a fragment ascribed to Melito of Sardis, printed in Routh's *Reliquiæ*, in which allusion is made to a Syriac version of Genesis. Another, in one of the writings bearing the name of Justin Martyr, speaks of a Syriac version of the Psalms. Eusebius also speaks of Hegesippus (before A.D. 170) as quoting the Syriac gospel. These, however, need not detain us: the antiquity and great value of

^a The word Peshito is explained to mean, simple, plain, right, or *straight-forward* as we say, probably because as *literal* as possible and *direct* from the originals; not from the Septuagint in the Old Testament, for example.

^b This opinion is strongly supported by the fact, that the ancient manuscripts of the Peshito are all without the books which last found everywhere a place in the canon, i.e. 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation, to which may be added John vii. 53, to viii. 11. The existence of the Peshito long before the *fourth* century is regarded as a well established fact.

the Peshito translation are now acknowledged by all; and it is to be hoped that with the aid of the very ancient Biblical MSS. now in our national Museum, we may by and bye be put in possession of a more reliable and critical edition than has yet been published.^c

It may be proper here, perhaps, just to allude to the very curious remains of a peculiar Syriac recension of the four Gospels some time since published by the discoverer, Canon Cureton. These interesting relics have been supposed by their learned editor to be part of a version more ancient than the Peshito. In this judgment others have apparently concurred. But a careful examination of the book has convinced some that it is of later date, and represents the efforts of some one who undertook to revise the simple ancient version.^d That it should be any more is opposed to the whole united testimony of Syrian writers in favour of the Peshito, as the most ancient version. This opinion is moreover justified by the internal structure of the text; and it receives very peculiar support from the learned work of Adler on the Syriac versions of the New Testament, who found in the Vatican an ancient MS. of the Syriac gospels belonging to the sixth century, which exhibits many of the identical readings of Dr. Cureton's recension. We may, therefore, safely leave the Peshito in undisputed possession of its claim to priority; none the less grateful to the reverend canon for his discovery and publication.

A very ancient tradition ascribes to apostolic times and the reign of Abgar Uchomo, or the Black, the introduction of Christianity at Edessa, where the Syriac seems to have been the vernacular, though probably not the only language in use there at that period. This important event tended powerfully to promote both the cultivation of the language and the creation of its literature. The school of Edessa produced several eminent men; and documents yet exist which in all probability emanated from it: and of some this is certain. There, and at Nisibis, and at a few other points, flourished the men whose names were first famous in connexion with this literature. It is extremely likely that the Peshito version was produced at Edessa or one other of the places now mentioned, for the use of the Christian churches (which at Edessa were under the patronage of Christian kings long before Constantine the Great).

^c Some of the MSS. of parts of this version, now in the British Museum, date at least from the fifth century.

^d He seems to have aimed at two objects, supplying what he regarded as deficiencies in the Peshito text, and correcting mistaken or objectionable expressions in its translation. He may have used a very ancient Greek MS. for this work.

There is one name which is very celebrated in connexion with this history, viz., *Bar Daisan*, or Bardesanes, whose philosophizing tendencies brought him into collision with the more orthodox party, and led them to rank him with heretics, and to brand him as a Gnostic.^e Eusebius, of Cæsarea, in his *Præparatio Evangelica*, quotes largely from a writing ascribed to Bardesanes, *On Fate*. The entire document from which this was taken has been discovered in the British Museum. It has also been published, with an English translation by Mr. Cureton, in the *Spicilegium Syriacum*. There is, however, good reason for believing that it is not the production of Bardesanes himself, but as it *almost* says, of one of his disciples named Philip, who reports the conversation with his master. Be this as it may, we must assign the composition to a Syriac origin, to Persia, and to an early period, in all likelihood not later than the close of the second century.

We should be disposed to place next in order the acts of Addi, otherwise called Thaddeus, also in the British Museum.^f The document is incomplete, but it seems to contain those portions of the narrative which Eusebius only abridged or referred to in his account of the conversion of Edessa, and which he says he obtained from a Syriac MS. in the archives of that city. He is doubtless correct in his statement; but he was wrong in supposing the MS. so ancient as he did, for if he had read on, he would have found that it could have been written but a very few years at most, as it mentions Zephyrinus of Rome.^g One or two others must be named. Isaiah of Arzun, about A.D. 320, wrote an account of the martyrdoms of several saints, and this is still extant. About the same period, or not much later, Jacob, the wise Persian, or Persian philosopher, who may have been the same as Jacob of Nisibis, wrote two series of essays on various subjects. These essays, twenty-four in number, are now in the British Museum; and if we may judge from an examination made several years ago, they are of peculiar interest and importance.^h

^e Much of the celebrity which Bardesanes attained to, is traceable to the zeal of Ephræm Syrus and others, whose controversial pages bristled with invectives against him. To his supposed heresy must be ascribed the (almost entire) destruction of what he wrote.

^f An account of this appeared in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* for July, 1858.

^g Early in the third century. But Zephyrinus is named in such a way as to shew that the apostolical succession through Peter's *Roman* successors was regarded as a matter of some consequence.

^h Partly theological, and partly historical, *e.g.*, on the sabbath, against the restoration of the Jews, on the persecution of Shapor, etc. We understand that Dr. Cureton is preparing these and other valuable remains for publication.

To mention Ephræm the Syrian will be sufficient to recall to mind one of the greatest ornaments of the Church and of the age in which he lived. Many of his writings are still extant in Greek, but perhaps as many or more in Syriac. He has been the admiration of all succeeding ages, and was in all respects a wonderful man, of whom we may safely say, "*Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*" It may be noticed, that he was one of the early teachers of the school at Edessa, and that some think he was its founder, but this is doubtful. The names and notices of many other Syriac authors of this and the following century may be found in that vast depository of Syrian erudition, the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Assemani, who has collected abundant materials for what relates to our subject, and whose work must be consulted by all who would become properly acquainted with that subject. The works of Dr. Etheridge also contain useful information on this matter, and will be found serviceable to those especially who have not time or opportunity to consult larger publications.

It might be wearisome to go into the details which still remain on record of the writings of those who followed the celebrities already named, and, therefore, he will only mention Narses of Edessa, in the fifth century; Jacob, also of Edessa; and Jacob of Serug of the same period, as eminent in their day. Time would fail to tell of Nestorius and his opposers. Let us, however, remind you of Xenaias or Philoxenus and Thomas of Charchel, or Heraclea, of the sixth century, in connexion with the production of a new version of the Scriptures of the New Testament, from the Greek. This valuable translation has been published, and will be found of decided value as a witness on behalf of certain readings of the Greek text, which was more literally than elegantly followed by its translators. About the same time, what is called the Hexaplar version of the Old Testament from the Septuagint, was executed in Egypt. Of this a large part is extant, and several important portions have been published. There was another Jacob of Edessa in the seventh century who was an eminent writer, and various works by him remain to this day. In the ninth century we meet with Moses Bar Cepha, and in the tenth, with Bar Bahlul, best known as the compiler of a Syro-Arabic lexicon. In the eleventh century, Abulpharagius was distinguished, and in the twelfth, Dionysius Bar Salibi. In the thirteenth century, Bar Hebræus, also called Abulpharagius, etc., was a very distinguished author; and we may say the same of Ebed Jesu in the century which followed.

We must for a moment return, to observe that from a very

early date all the principal Greek fathers, and some of the classic authors, were translated into Syriac, and of the extant literature of the language translations form by far the larger portion.

With the revival of letters, the knowledge of Syriac was introduced into Western Europe by Syrians. In connexion with this comes the appearance of a printed edition of the Peshito New Testament at Vienna in 1555, which ought to be regarded as an epoch in the literary history of Europe. The circumstances connected with the one and the other of these events may be just alluded to. When the fifth Lateran Council was called by Julius II. in 1512, there came to Rome to the synod three Syrians—Joseph, Moses, and Elias. These men wished to perform divine service in their own language and after their own rite; but they were prohibited from doing so, until it should be known what form they employed. One of the cardinals therefore required Theseus Ambrosius, a lawyer, to procure a Latin version of the Syriac office. As Ambrosius was ignorant of the language, he had to learn it in the best way he could, with the help of a little Arabic and his Syrian friends. In 1539 he published a grammar, in ten languages, including the Syriac, which had been several years printing, and this was the first work on the subject which appeared in Europe. His labours in collecting manuscripts were most praiseworthy, and he projected various works which he never completed, and his manuscript treasures were mostly lost or destroyed amid the confusion of civil war. He found a worthy successor, however, in Albert Widmanstadt, also a lawyer, to whom he gave an ancient MS. copy of the four Gospels. Widmanstadt obtained other manuscripts, and earnestly desired to print an edition of the New Testament. While he was thus engaged, Moses of Merdin was sent into Europe by the patriarch of Antioch, with a copy of the New Testament, to have it printed in Europe. But no one could be found, either at Rome or at Venice, who would undertake the task. At length he was directed to Widmanstadt. The matter was laid before the emperor, who readily promoted the undertaking, and, by the joint labours of Moses and Widmanstadt, the edition was printed at Vienna, as already said, and soon after published. Six other editions came out in the course of that century, in the following order: viz., a second edition, in Hebrew characters, with a Latin version, published at Heidelberg, by Tremellius, in 1568; a third, in the Antwerp polyglott, in 1571; a fourth and fifth also at Antwerp, in 1575; a sixth at Paris, in 1584; and a seventh at Nuremberg, in 1599 and 1600. During the next century five other editions appear to have been printed; viz., that of Trostius, in 1621; that in the Paris polyglott, in 1645;

that in Walton's polyglott, in 1653; that of Gutbir, in 1664; and one at Sulzbach, in 1684.

In the meantime, the learned Edward Pococke published in 1630 a small volume containing 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude; and in 1627 De Dieu published the Apocalypse, all which had been wanting in previous editions. It may be remarked, also, that Walton's polyglott was the first which contained the history of the adulteress in John viii.ⁱ The edition of Leusden and Schaaf at Leyden in 1709,^k with a concordance-lexicon, was more complete than any of its predecessors, and is still a very valuable book. Since then, various, but not many, editions have been published, among which that of Dr. Lee is probably the most valuable, and certainly the best known. An edition which shall give the results of recent critical investigations of the many manuscripts now in Europe is still greatly to be desired.

Of grammars not much need be said. That of Ambrosius has been mentioned. It was followed by that of Caninius in 1554, by that of Widmanstadt in 1555, and that of Mercer in 1560. Tremellius published one in 1569, and the zealous Andrew Masius in 1570. That of George Amira, a member of the Maronite College at Rome,^l was published in 1596, and is still a work of importance. The first Englishman who attempted anything in this way seems to have been Christopher Ravis, who published a general grammar of Hebrew, Samaritan, Chaldee, *Syriac*, Arabic, and Ethiopic in 1648. The second was Brian Walton, in 1653, etc.; and the third, William Beveridge, in 1658. During the present century Syriac grammars have been published by three or four Englishmen:—by Yeates, in 1818, by (Nolan?), Phillips, and Cowper; but the fullest are probably those of Hoffmann in Latin, and Uhlemann (second edition) in German, translated and published in America.

The first European work in lexicography seems to have been published by Masius in 1571. That of Ferrarius in 1622, although very defective, is still useful. That by Castell, though quite insufficient, is valuable, and especially in Michaelis's re-

ⁱ With regard to the books not printed by Widmanstadt, etc., *i.e.*, 2 and 3 John, Jude, 2 Peter, and Revelation, we often hear them called a part of the Philoxenian version, but this seems to be an error. They are translated on a very different principle, and resemble the Peshito in their style and character. Their true origin we are unacquainted with, but we cannot class them with the Peshito. The passage in John viii. may be more modern.

^k There are nominally three editions of Schaaf, but they only differ in their title pages. This work is curious as the first work, or one of the first works, stereotyped.

^l Founded by Pope Gregory XIV.

print. For the New Testament, the lexicon of Schaaf is very useful. That of Gutbir, whether his own edition or the one brought out by Dr. Henderson, is of no value. There is still no complete Lexicon, either for the Old and New Testaments, or for the entire language. Dr. Bernstein was more than twenty years engaged on a great work which should include all known words; the first part has been published, but the author has died, and it cannot be completed.^m It is with the grammar as it is with the lexicon, new idioms and words are continually coming to light, and will probably do so until the mass of existing manuscripts has been thoroughly read and studied.

It would occupy too much space to give an account of other works on the literature and language, although many of them are both interesting and important. Nor will we enumerate the books in the language itself, which have been printed during the last few years especially, although all of them are curious, and some of them are valuable. Let us rather look for a moment at the large mass of Syriac manuscripts which now invites the zeal and the learning of the student. The principal depositories of these ancient relics are Rome, Paris, and London. A good number are at Oxford, and Cambridge, and most of the large European libraries have at least a few, not to mention those which are in private hands.

A full account of the chief Syriac treasures at the Vatican has been published by Assemani in his great work, already named the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. Those at Paris, amounting as near, as far as appears from a hasty personal examination, to about two hundred and forty-five volumes, are either unexplored, or no good account of them has appeared. The manuscripts at other places, also, still remain for the most part inedited or undescribed. The first great instalment of the collection at the British Museum, consisting of those acquired by the late Mr. Rich, the British consul at Bagdad, has received the honour of an admirable catalogue. The greater portion, however, obtained between 1840 and 1850 from a monastery in the Nitrian desert of Scete in Egypt, still remain without this essential clue to their true character and worth.ⁿ A few individuals have gone more or less fully into an examination of them, and now a competent librarian is employed upon them. Among those who have explored them, the first place is, doubtless, due to Mr. Cureton, whose zeal in securing, arrang-

^m We have heard of two or three who are preparing Syriac lexicons. One of them is Mr. Payne Smith of Oxford. (*See Note, p. 87 below.*)

ⁿ The MSS. as bound amount to about 600 volumes.

ing, examining, and otherwise labouring in connexion with these manuscripts, entitles him to the highest praise. Another who has wrought among them is Dr. de Lagarde of Berlin; and a third is Dr. Land of Amsterdam. The writer of this article has gone through and carefully noted the character and contents of all the chief manuscripts in the collection.

Until the wished-for catalogue appears, it is to be hoped that those who have leisure and the necessary qualifications will make such use of these precious relics, that we shall not even seem to lose the honour of their possession by our supineness and neglect. With the exception of a very few texts and translations, nothing of importance has been published from this source; and of what has been done, no small part has been done by foreigners: such as Renan, de Lagarde, and Dr. Land, not that we forget Dr. Cureton, etc.

We must not now attempt to describe the number, age, contents, appearance, and general condition of these manuscripts, because this would involve a longer discourse than is desirable, and prevent us from saying a few words upon a point to which we are anxious for a moment to advert; we mean the general fortunes of the Syriac language after it commenced to be employed extensively for literary purposes.

At a very early period it began to receive importations from the Greek, which, in some later documents, is a very prominent element. The work of John of Ephesus published by Dr. Cureton, and written probably about A.D. 590, abounds in these Greek forms. Besides the Greek, a little was contributed by the Latin, much by the Persian and Arabic, and more or less by the Armenian and other dialects. By these means, as well as by the inconveniences resulting from Moslem domination, and other causes, the Syriac lost much of its original simplicity, purity, and force. As a vernacular, the language was at one time most extensively used, but was, in process of time, supplanted in different directions, chiefly by those which corrupted it, viz., by the Arabic, the Armenian, and the Persian; and, perhaps, later by the Turkish. In some districts it underwent dialectic variations; and in its altered form, as already remarked, it is still used by the Nestorians of Oroomiah, and probably by some others. The old language always was and still is used in the public rituals of the Syrian church, just as the Greek, Armenian, Latin, Hebrew, etc., have maintained their ground for similar purposes.

The Neo-Syriac employed by the Nestorians of Oroomiah, of which a grammar was published by the late excellent and lamented missionary, the Rev. D. T. Stoddard, and in which

the American missionaries have published the Bible and other works, is sufficient to disprove the assertion of Renan that there is no such thing as a Neo-Syriac, the existence of which he regards as well nigh impossible.

As with the language, so with its caligraphy, the more recent manuscripts almost invariably betray their degenerate age. The most ancient documents known were written during the fifth century (from 412 A.D.), and for the most part are admirably executed, in a large legible and correctly drawn character. Many of those which were written, in the three following centuries, are very beautifully done. But in general, the more modern a manuscript, the worse it is written.^o The oldest characters used in existing manuscripts are of the type commonly called *Estrangelo*; but this was superseded by the simpler and far less elegant form which furnished the pattern for most of our printed Syriac books. The characters employed in the so-called Jerusalem version of the New Testament, of which only some fragments are known, and which can hardly be called Syriac at all, varied from both the others, but in their general aspect most resembled the *Estrangelo*. Those used by the Nestorians at the present day come nearer to the simpler or later form, although they differ both in appearance and number. It is in vain for us to discuss now the origin of these differing types; but it may be remarked that, on many accounts, it is desirable we should return in our printed books at least to an approximation to the old *Estrangelo*, the best and most appropriate of all the forms of Syriac letters. Those who have to write the language, however, will find it most convenient to adopt the ordinary character, which may be written with greater ease and rapidity than the rest.

In bringing these very superficial notes to a conclusion, there are one or two points which we wish to have remembered:—1. The importance of the study of Syriac to those who would be well acquainted with the Shemitic dialects generally. 2. The value of Syriac to the right understanding of the Hebrew and Greek originals of the Bible. 3. The possible use of Syriac in facilitating the translation of many cuneiform inscriptions which are confessedly written in a language not very dissimilar.

There are other considerations, some of which have been

^o The Nestorians still write most beautifully. Some travellers have alluded to this, and we have seen it exemplified in London this summer. A Nestorian priest Yohanan, and a companion Yusef, have been in England. Yohanan writes with extraordinary accuracy and elegance in the characters employed by the Nestorians of Oroomiah.

already urged, and these all together justify us in saying it is strange that the study of Syriac has been so much neglected by private scholars, and so little encouraged in our colleges and universities, where, above all, it ought to be promoted, for Syriac ought to be inseparably connected with the study of Hebrew.

NOTE.

At present no Syriac English lexicon has been published. Some years since, the Editor of this Journal offered to the publishers a Syriac-English lexicon to the New Testament and Psalms; but it was declined because such works did not pay. It was intended to issue eventually an alphabetical lexicon to the whole of the Bible; but such has been the difficulty of discovering any chance of its being taken up by the booksellers, that the manuscript, although very far advanced, has been left incomplete. So it will probably continue—the only result of an immense amount of labour continued for years. The lexicon, so far as it has gone, is executed on the plan of the Hebrew manuals of Gesenius and Fürst, but on a reduced scale. This want of a lexicon is now the great stumbling-block in the way of the study of the Syriac Scriptures among us. The one appended to Walton's Polyglott is of course not only imperfect and hard to procure, but forms a member of a whole body of lexicons. The separate edition, with the improvements of Michaelis, is also defective as applied to the whole language; it is in Latin, is arranged after the old plan of roots and their derivatives, and will soon be a scarce book. Yet this is the best the student can procure for his purpose. Bernstein's lexicon to Kirsch's *Chrestomathy* is excellent, but it only comprises the words of the *Chrestomathy*. The old book of Ferrarius is really a vocabulary arranged alphabetically, but in two alphabets. The lexicon of Zanolini is alphabetical, but only contains the words of the New Testament. The lexicons of Schindler, Trostius, Buxtorf, etc., only occupy the same ground. This may suffice to shew our poverty in the matter of lexicons; and it may be added that no lexicon of the Syriac has yet appeared in any modern language. Besides the English grammars mentioned at p. 83, allusion may be made to a few pages on the subject, a second edition of which appeared at Edinburgh in 1821. A meagre outline has also been published by Messrs. Bagster.

LIFE AND MIRACLES OF APOLLONIUS OF TYANA.*

CONSIDERABLE mystery hangs over the personage of whom we are about to speak, although we have a professedly very minute account of him in the work of Philostratus. At least since the time of Eusebius of Cæsarea, the name of Apollonius has been familiar to scholars, and there have been those who have ventured to institute a parallel between his asserted miracles and those of Christ and his apostles. There are reasons why at the present day it may be useful, as it must be interesting, to devote some little space to a consideration of what is recorded of this famous traveller, philosopher, and miracle worker. We propose, therefore, to look at some of these matters, and we shall freely avail ourselves of the recent work of M. Chassang, alluded to in the note. Of that work we may say that the introduction is very instructive, that the translation is pleasant reading, and that the notes contain a fund of information which indicates both careful and extensive research.

We shall commence with a few of the topics touched upon by M. Chassang in his introduction. He observes that even in his lifetime, Apollonius was honoured as a sage, feared as a magician, and venerated as a god or supernatural being. For a time he was famous in the Church. In the eighteenth century antichristian polemics revived his name, but now he is merely looked on as a precursor of Swedenborg. The writer of the life of Apollonius, Philostratus of Lemnos, was born in the reign of Nero, and wrote a number of works, several of which are extant. This Philostratus taught rhetoric at Rome and Athens; and he professes to have penned his life of Apollonius at the request of the empress Julia Domna, wife of Septimus Severus. If this is true, we can readily understand that he spared no pains to produce a work which should fully satisfy the credulity of his patroness; nor is it to be expected that in a scientific point of view his work should be other than worthless. M. Chassang compares this biography with the *Heroics* of the same author, and very properly classes them both with the romances of antiquity. That it is a fiction like *Huon de Bordeaux*, *Lancelot du Lac*, *Amadis des Gaules*, or even *Don Quixote*, has been ably maintained by different authors. Even supposing there is an

* *Le Merveilleux dans l'Antiquité. Apollonius de Tyane, sa vie, ses voyages, ses prodiges, par Philostrate; et ses Lettres, ouvrages traduits du Grec, avec Introduction, Notes, et Eclaircissements.* Par A. Chassang. Paris: Didier et Cie, 1862.

original basis in truth, no one perhaps will venture to call the true in it more than a minimum quantity. Whether partly or wholly false, however, it is our only authority upon the subject.

It would be hopeless to attempt what Legrand d'Aussy undertook—to give a critical history of the life of Apollonius. In such a work the marvellous or supernatural would present insuperable obstacles at every step. The life of Apollonius must be taken as it is, and no one can treat it fairly who leaves out the miraculous elements alluded to.

M. Chassang gives us a rapid summary of the history of the book of Philostratus, and of the representation of his hero, down to our own day, and we know not that we can do better than translate his very words:—

“Everything leads to the belief,” he says, “that as Philostratus has remarked, even in his lifetime, and above all, after his death, which he took care to conceal, Apollonius of Tyana was considered by a certain number of pagans as a divine being. Eunapius (fourth century) says that he held the mean between the gods and men, and defines his life as ‘the journey of a god on earth.’ The historian Vopiscus (fourth century) informs us that he proposes to write the life of this sage, who is for him more than a man, and of whom he narrates a sort of posthumous miracle. Dion Cassius (third century) inserts in his *Roman History* (lib. 57) one of the most marvellous facts related of Apollonius. Ammianus Marcellinus (fourth century) places him (lib. 21, 14) with Pythagorus, Socrates, Numa Pompilius, and Plotinus among the privileged men who lived assisted by a familiar genius. Caracalla consecrated to him an *Heroum*; Alexander Severus placed his image in his *Lararium* by the side of that of Jesus Christ, that of Abraham, and that of Orpheus; and Aurelian made a vow to build him a temple.

“Yet already, and Philostratus tells us so often, there were not wanting people who, among the pagans themselves, saw nothing in Apollonius but a magician: a great portion of the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* is consecrated to the destruction of this opinion which had subjected Apollonius to judgment under Domitian, and which the defence of Philostratus could not abolish. When Apuleius was accused of magic and rebutted the accusation, he defends himself from being an Apollonius of Tyana. Lucian, who scarcely believed in magic, speaks of Apollonius as a cheat who set himself, like other pretended magicians, to make sport of the credulity of men. But absolute sceptics like Lucian were rare. In general, men believed in the miracles of Apollonius of Tyana; only some attributed them to a divine power, and others to magic. When, too, early in the fourth century, Hierocles undertook in his *Philalethes* to sustain the first of these opinions, Eusebius did not hesitate to pronounce for the second, in the treatise where he refutes Hierocles, and which is extant. Eusebius makes no difficulty of putting Apollonius among the most celebrated philosophers; but he questions the miracles which are ascribed to him, and declares that they could only come of

magic. To magic also they are referred by Lactantius and Arnobius. The author of *Questions and Answers to the Orthodox*, attributed to Justin, differs in his point of view from Eusebius, but takes the point of view which almost all later writers will occupy; he does not deny the reality of the prodigies, but he sees in them the result, partly of the knowledge of natural sciences which Apollonius had, and partly the intervention of the devil.

“From the time when Hierocles, the only writer who had attacked the Christian faith, had taken it into his head to oppose Apollonius of Tyana to Jesus Christ, it seems as if his very name was to be hateful to all Christians. Yet, even after Eusebius, we see in the fifth century Cassiodorus and the monk Isidore of Pelusium pronounce his name with esteem; and the bishop of Clermont, Sidonius Apollinarius, translated into Latin the work of Philostratus, which had previously been abridged, or altered by divers authors, as Nicomachus and Tarcus Victorianus, cited by Sidonius himself, and a certain Soterichus of the Oasis, a contemporary of Hierocles, pointed out by Suidas. No one will be surprised that a monk like Isidore of Pelusium, and a rhetor who late in life became a bishop, as Sidonius Apollinarius, had been little aware of the danger which was offered to a Christianity not yet well established, by the fame of a person as strange as Apollonius of Tyana. But the priests who were mixed up in the movement, the fathers of the church in the fourth century for example, are unanimous in accusing Philostratus of falsehood, or in taxing Apollonius with magic. There is a place in St. Augustine, where that holy doctor compares Apollonius of Tyana to Jupiter, and owns that Apollonius was, for continence at least, superior to the god of Olympus. This passage, joined to some pages of the *Reply of Eusebius to Hierocles*, gives us to understand that there were still obstinate worshippers of Apollonius of Tyana. But the moment was not distant when this wretched divinity was to be carried away with those that were most powerful.

“It was natural that the indisputable triumph of Christianity should allay all the anger that the name of Apollonius of Tyana had been able to excite. The Byzantine writers speak indeed sometimes of Apollonius as a magician, but without attaching an unfavourable sense to the word. Some magicians by profession also attribute his prodigies to the knowledge of secret causes, and find them unworthy of being compared with the works of true magic. Cedrenus, Georgius Syncellus, and Johannes Malela, insert in their histories an abridgement of the life of Apollonius, after Philostratus, as though to render homage to one of the saints of paganism. Tzetzes, in his *Chiliads*, repeats the same things, and adds others which are not less marvellous. Photius alone speaks slightly of the book and its hero; the life of Apollonius is to him nothing but a tissue of idle fables, and he declares it to be frivolous and useless reading. But at the same time he praises the author and lauds the proprieties of his narrative. The judgment of Photius is that of many moderns, and of critics even, who incline to think that the renown of Apollonius of Tyana is in great part the work of Philostratus. But with what precedes, it is to exaggerate the importance of this rhetorician to believe that but for

him Apollonius would have been unknown. Assuredly it is not the book of Philostratus which has won for its hero divine honours. It has been able to perpetuate to our day the name of Apollonius of Tyana, but it is not it which spread abroad his name in ancient times, nor has it given to this personage the physiognomy under which he appears to us. Because Philostratus has mixed up many fictions in his account of the *Life of Apollonius*, it does not follow that all his fictions come from him, nor that his recital is wholly fictitious.

“From the sixteenth century to the eighteenth, criticism hardly viewed Apollonius of Tyana in an impartial spirit. The marvellous of which his biography is full, having seemed fitted to be turned against the gospels, writers preoccupied with the perils of the faith have only spoken of him with scorn and indignation. With some he is a cheat, an impostor; and all the marvels which Philostratus attributes to him are so many lies. To others he is a magician who had made a contract with the devil, and who, by this detestable commerce, succeeded in astounding and seducing men. On the other side, the philosophers of the eighteenth century, Voltaire at their head, have affected to confound in equal scepticism the prodigies of Apollonius of Tyana and the miracles of Jesus Christ. The attempt of Hierocles was in some sort renewed by a French translation which was preceded by an ironical dedication to the pope, Clement XIV., a dedication signed Philalethes, and attributed to Frederic II.

“Now that religious polemics are removed to a different domain, the work of Philostratus is judged with a more free spirit. Scarcely any one sees in it either a systematic confutation of the gospels, or a weapon indirectly aimed against Christianity. It is generally recognized as a book consecrated to the glory of philosophy, an idealised picture of one of the last representatives of ancient wisdom. But it is probable that the narration of marvellous facts preoccupied Philostratus far more than the speculations upon which he might have let his hero enter. M. Ritter thinks that the doctrines of Apollonius had ‘a profound meaning;’ but we must own that it is difficult to judge from the superficial, incomplete, and confused exposition of them which Philostratus gives. Philostratus makes the miracle-worker known rather than the philosopher. Everything leads us to believe that it is the miracle-worker who interests him most in his hero; and to be convinced of this, we have only to compare the *Heroics* with the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. What cannot be contested is the part of Apollonius in the history of the marvellous among the Greeks, and that of his biography in the literature consecrated to this order of ideas. The name of Apollonius of Tyana, like those of Simon Magus, Plotinus, Porphyry, etc., offers itself spontaneously to every writer who, in one sense or in another, treats of the history of the marvellous. According to the best accredited representatives of ‘Spiritualism,’ or the ‘spirit doctrine,’ the greater part of reputed marvellous facts are wrought by the action of the invisible world upon the visible world, one of the active forces of nature not understood to this day by science, and thus they enter into the domain of natural facts. Spiritualism, without accepting as authentic, or even as possible, all the facts attributed to Apollonius of Tyana, explains a great part of them by their similitude to phenomena

which are produced under the influence of certain ‘mediums,’ and of which it propounds the theory, whence it concludes that Apollonius was a sort of medium. Recently a man of talent (M. Dumas) who has touched upon everything, after having sought in different epochs of history subjects for his romances, has availed himself of the stories of Philostratus about Apollonius of Tyana, to fill with them several chapters of a fantastic novel. Henceforth it may be said, that the name of Apollonius of Tyana does not belong to religious polemics; it has descended into the more modest sphere of controversy relating to the marvellous.”

The preceding extracts contain much curious and instructive matter; but we are not wholly satisfied with some of the conclusions arrived at. For example, we are not sure that one of the ancient authors cited or referred to is independent of Philostratus. Every one of them is later, nor is there any trace of Apollonius in any author who preceded Philostratus. It is true that he quotes or mentions several; but either these authors only exist in his pages, or they have written nothing which has been thought worthy of preservation. We do not intend to say that Philostratus invented his authorities when he quoted, and his facts when he narrated; but we suspect it would not be difficult to maintain such a position. What is certain is, that Philostratus wrote this book in the second century, and that a century later it was made by Hierocles the basis of an artful attack upon the Gospels. It assumed to be a history, and it was treated as such, although its incidents resemble a pagan life of some Simon Magus, whose doings and sayings remind us forcibly of the Simon Magus of the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies. In both these cases there was probably a historical pretender who supplied the basis of the story, and more than this we are not inclined to concede. Of the actual life of Apollonius we know extremely little. He comes before us dressed up like a character in a pantomime, rather than as a sober, historical reality. Philostratus is of course minute enough to satisfy any one, but it is the minuteness of Don Quixote or of Robinson Crusoe. A romance was to be written, and for this a hero had to be found. Apollonius furnished the text, and Philostratus wove out of that text a tissue of strange pattern and unearthly lines. That later and uncritical ages accepted this bizarre composition as a true history need not be wondered at. What is to be wondered at is, that modern writers should be found who try to construct a veritable history out of a substantial fiction; and that some should have ventured to institute a parallel between the miraculous stories told of Apollonius, and the miracles of the New Testament. Beyond question it is the invidious use which Hierocles made of this tale, which made it

so prominent as it has been since, just as it was a similar use of it before and in the last century which induced Christian apologists to say more or less about it.

It may be admitted, that Philostratus wrote his book at the request of the Empress Julia, of whom Gibbon says:—"She applied herself to letters and philosophy with some success and great application, and was the patroness of every art, and the friend of every man of genius." We do not know what Julia called philosophy, but it is possible that it included the favorite pursuits of her husband, about whom Gibbon again tells us that "he was passionately addicted to the vain studies of magic and divination; was deeply versed in the interpretation of dreams and omens, and perfectly acquainted with the science of judicial astrology." The Rev. E. Berwick, who published the first complete English translation of the *Life of Apollonius*, in 1809, remarks upon these statements as follows:—

"In a court which patronized such studies and pursuits, we are not surprised to learn that the talents of Philostratus were encouraged, his skill in rhetoric applauded, and the wishes of the Empress obeyed with alacrity. A woman like Julia, attached so much to letters, was naturally desirous of knowing every circumstance respecting so extraordinary a person as she might have been informed Apollonius was, in whose particular character were combined all the leading features and prevailing sentiments then so fashionable in the court of her husband. Philostratus was a passionate admirer of Pythagoras, and as such must have had great pleasure in bringing into public notice and esteem the character of one who was so strict and zealous a follower of the rules and maxims of the enlightened sage of Samos."

But without loading our pages with arguments and opinions, it may suffice to say, that whoever or whatever Apollonius was, Philostratus made a book about him which was intended and calculated to please and flatter his imperial patrons. Their science was probably half quackery, and their philosophy semi-nonsense, and the court-writer and rhetorician suited his work to their taste. Even if we admit the real existence of such a person as Apollonius, and that his mythical life was talked of in those days, Philostratus was, we are convinced, a romancer, who took care to magnify and multiply the strange stories current about his hero. We do not think for a moment that Philostratus had Christianity in view. It was the opinion of Dr. Lardner, that the book was written as a counterpart to the life of Pythagoras, and free from any direct allusion to the life of Christ. Even Gibbon admits, that although ancient stories of Pythagoras and Aristeas, the cures performed at the shrine of Esculapius, and the fables related of Apollonius of Tyana, were

frequently opposed to the miracles of Christ ; yet Philostratus had no such intention in writing his book.

The Greek text of the life of Apollonius was published with a Latin translation by Aldus in 1501. In 1532, a Latin version by Alemanus Rhinuccinus of Florence, appeared at Cologne with the essay of Eusebius against Hierocles, also in Latin. An Italian version was printed at Venice in 1549. Blaise de Vigenere brought out a French version in 1599. Charles Blount published, in 1680, an English translation of the first two books ; and the translator says he had translated the whole, but was prevented from publishing by reason of the outcry raised against him of the danger which would follow its publication. The book was then considered so perilous to the Christian religion that it was speedily suppressed, and but few copies of it got abroad. Let it however be borne in mind, that the harm expected to result from the work of Blount was supposed to lie less in the translation than in the notes, which were of so deistical a tendency that it was thought they were written by Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Nothing more was attempted towards a translation in English till the work of the Rev. Edward Berwick, vicar of Leixlip, near Dublin, which appeared in 1809, as already stated. We are not aware of any other English version, and as this work is not common, probably very few have seen it. There is a note in Berwick's Preface not undeserving of being copied ; it is to this effect :—

“Accounts of supernatural events found only in historians by some ages posterior to the transactions, and of which it is evident that the historian could know little more than his reader, offer no evidence that is satisfactory or can be depended on. This judicious observation of Mr. Paley deserves the utmost attention, as it applies with considerable force to the miracles ascribed to Apollonius in the following *solitary* history, published by Philostratus above one hundred years after his death, and in which, whether the writer had any prior account, depends upon his single unsupported evidence. Besides, continues the same learned writer, accounts of supernatural events published in one country, of what passed in a distant country, without any proof that such accounts were known, or received at home, can offer no evidence that is to be depended on. This distinction, he adds, disposes of the aforesaid miracles of Apollonius, most of which are related to have been wrought in India, of which no evidence remains that either the miracles ascribed to him, or the history of those miracles, were ever heard of in India.”

There is another passage in Mr. Berwick's Preface which we will quote, as it shews how the work of Philostratus was viewed by Casaubon, by Blount, and by himself :—

“Though the books of Philostratus, says Casaubon, contain many

fabulous things, as any man may expect from the undertaking, yet they have so much truth and variety of ancient learning, that I think they deserve a more attentive consideration than what has fallen to their lot. I thought, writes Blount in his Preface, the many descriptions in Philostratus of remote countries and former customs, so different from our own; the various hints of ancient history, wherein our author is esteemed authentic, as well as the philosophical discourses on the subject of morality, might be not only entertaining, but useful to every reader that perused him. Besides the aforesaid reasons, which I deem independent of others fully sufficient to justify the undertaking at this day, I thought the want of such a translation a defect in English literature, and in some respects a reflection on the liberal and enlightened character of the country. I thought it also necessary to lay before the English reader an entire translation of the whole history of Apollonius, to enable him the better to form his opinion of the character of the man, it being the only account of him which was referred to about a century after its appearance, in preference to all others, by Hierocles, who first endeavoured to draw a comparison between Christ and Apollonius, and which account was fully admitted by Eusebius in the reply he made to his foolish and impious attack. Next I wished to shew the fallacy of the comparison, which could only fairly be done by a perusal of the whole life, from which I think it will appear, that Apollonius was one of those cunning imposters who, by his superior skill, could perform certain wonderful things, for the purpose of acquiring character and consequence among the vulgar, and that it was in the light of a magician he was considered by his two contemporaries, Lucian and Apuleius, of whom the one says, his false prophet was educated in his school (and from the pupil we may judge of the master), and the other ranks him amongst the most celebrated magicians."

We now go on to look at the actual sketch of the life of Apollonius, as preserved in the pages of Philostratus. It is divided into eight books. The author clearly regards Apollonius as a Pythagorean, and rebuts the accusation that he was a magician. He says he has collected the life of his hero from many sources; from the cities which loved him; from temples restored by him; from letters written by him; and, above all, from the memoirs prepared, but not published, by Damis the Ninevite, a disciple of Apollonius. The work of Damis fell into the hands of the Empress Julia, who requested Philostratus to recast it, and improve its style. In accomplishing his task, he was further aided by the books of Maximus of Egea, the Testament of Apollonius, and a work by Moeragenes. It may be added, that all these sources of information have disappeared, except perhaps some of the letters of Apollonius, which are printed by M. Chassang.

Apollonius was born at Tyana, in Cappadocia, of an ancient family; his birth was preceded by ominous dreams, and attended by prodigies. As a child, Apollonius displayed extraordinary

qualities of person, mind, memory, and disposition, and rapidly advanced in intelligence and learning. He devoted himself to the principles of Pythagoras, lived abstemiously, let his hair grow, went barefoot, and wore only linen. Much of his time was spent in the temple of Esculapius, who told the priest he took pleasure in performing cures before a witness like Apollonius. No wonder that he soon became a celebrity. Esculapius sent to him one of his patients, saying, "If thou wilt consult Apollonius thou shalt be well," and so it happened. On another occasion Apollonius declared the true but unknown cause of the misfortune of a man who had lost an eye, and came to Esculapius to get it restored. On another occasion he prophetically anticipated the downfall of a wicked man. After spending a considerable time at Ægæ in Cilicia, during which time he changed the temple of Esculapius into a lyceum and academy, he practised five years of silence according to the Pythagorean discipline. When his law of silence was fully obeyed, he went to Antioch, where he acquired great influence and fame; but he left this city to travel on to India, intending to converse with the Magi of Babylon and the Brahmins of India. At Nineveh he met with Damis, who became his companion, and of whom Philostratus gives the following account:—

"The Ninevite soon became attached to him, and being fond of travelling, said, Let us go—'*God shalt be your guide, and you shall be mine.*' I think I may serve you on the journey, for if I know anything, it is the road leading to Babylon, together with the towns and villages on the way, wherein can be found any accommodation, it being not long since I returned from thence. I am, besides, acquainted with the languages of the barbarians, namely, the Armenians, Medes, Persians, and Cadusians. But, my friend, returned Apollonius, I know them all myself, though I never learnt them. Whilst Damis stood in amaze at what he heard: Do not be surprised, continued Apollonius, at my knowing all tongues, for I know the very thoughts of men, even what they do not say. When Damis heard this he adored him, considering him as a demon. He then became a proselyte to his opinions, and whatever he learnt from him, he did not forget. This Assyrian had some eloquence, though from his education among barbarians, ignorant of all the rules which constitute elegance in writing. Yet his observation of whatever was either said or done in company was acute, and he kept an exact account of all that passed, which appears from a book he wrote called the *Apolloniana*.—Damis was desirous to learn everything of Apollonius, and as desirous to put down in his book every circumstance, however minute and trifling. The answer he made to one who condemned this kind of writing was neat and apposite. It was to an envious impertinent fellow who said that there were some things he wrote of Apollonius well enough, particularly his opinions and sayings, but that the crumbs he collected put him in

mind of the dogs that eat of whatever falls from their master's table. To this criticism Damis made the following reply : If the gods have feasts, and eat at them, they have also attendants who wait on them ; and whose business it is to take care that none of the ambrosia be lost. Such was the friend and companion by whom Apollonius was accompanied during a great part of his life."

The nonsense in this passage, about Apollonius knowing all languages, is refuted by other statements in the book ; but surpassed, when the Tyanean is said to have attained to the knowledge of the language of brutes during a visit to Arabia.

Apollonius and his Damis set out on their travels, and, from this point, the real active life of the philosopher may be said to begin. We cannot undertake to follow him in his wanderings, to repeat his sayings, or to record his actions. He visited Babylon, whither his fame had preceded him, and where he was treated with all honour. Before reaching the court he predicted that his stay there would be a year and eight months. A long account is given of his stay with Vardanes the king, who finally allows him to depart. He then proceeded to Mount Caucasus ; after which, a strange and fabulous history follows. In due time he arrived in India, about which many absurd stories are told. The whole narrative is sprinkled with the discourses of Apollonius, some of which are sensible enough, and others sufficiently ridiculous. Apollonius is introduced to the king, by whom he was royally entertained. He goes on a pilgrimage to the Brahmins, who welcomed him joyfully, and conversed with him on a multitude of subjects. Four months were passed among the Indian sages. Apollonius then travelled by land and sea back to Babylon, and on to Antioch, Seleucia, and Cyprus. He then visited Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, and Troy, and had an interview with the ghost of Achilles. Next he visited Greece, and at Athens imparted his wisdom to willing disciples. Here, too, he cast out a demon from a young man who was possessed. From Athens he went over the cities of Greece. At Corinth he displayed his powers in the discovery of an Empusa, a mere phantom in the form of a woman, who had ensnared a young man into a promise of marriage, intending to devour him. Afterwards we find him at Rome, and, among the remarkable things narrated of him while there, the following occurs :—

"What I am going to relate is set down among the marvellous acts of Apollonius. A girl on the point of being married, seemingly died, whose bier was followed by him who was to have been her husband, in all the affliction usual in like cases of interrupted wedlock. As she happened to be of a consular family, all Rome condoled with him. Apollonius,

meeting the funeral procession, said to the attendants, set down the bier, and I will dry up the tears which you are shedding for the maid, whose name he inquired after. Almost all the spectators present thought he was going to pronounce a funeral oration like what is done on such occasions to excite compassion. But all he did was, to touch the maid, and after uttering a few words over her in a low tone of voice, he wakened her from that death with which she seemed to be overcome. She immediately began to speak, and returned to her father's house, as Alcestis did of old, when recalled to life by Hercules. The relations of the girl presented Apollonius with an hundred and fifty thousand drachmas, which he in return begged to settle on her, as a marriage-portion. It is as difficult to me as it was to all who were present, to ascertain whether Apollonius discovered the vital spark, which had escaped the faculty (for it is said, it rained at the time, which caused a vapour to rise from her face), or whether he cherished and brought back to life the soul, which to all appearance was extinct."

From Rome, Apollonius went to visit the pillars of Hercules, and Spain, Sicily, Greece, and Egypt. In Egypt, he saw and conversed with the sages of the country. Among other things, he made known to a man who had a tame lion, that the said brute was animated by the soul of Amasis, formerly king of Egypt at Sais. In upper Egypt, Apollonius saw the Gymnosophists, with whom he had long discussions. He wrote to Titus after the fall of Jerusalem, and gave him counsel in personal interviews. Subsequently he continued his wanderings from place to place, everywhere honoured as a philosopher or as a divine person. At last, in the reign of Domitian, he was cited to Rome, accused before the emperor, of various crimes and offences, and cast into prison. While in prison, among other things, the following took place:—

"Sometime before mid-day, Damis said to him, O Tyanean (an appellation with which he was always pleased), what do you think will become of us? Nothing but what has usually happened to us, returned Apollonius, for there is no one will put us to death. And do you think, replied Damis, any one is invulnerable? Who, after saying this, asked, But when, sir, will you be set at liberty? To-morrow, answered he, if it depended on the judge; and this instant, if it depended on myself. And without a word more, he drew his leg out of the fetters, and said to Damis, You see the liberty I enjoy, and therefore I request you will keep up your spirits. It was on this occasion, Damis says, he was first sensible of Apollonius possessing a nature something divine, and above what was human. For without offering sacrifice, which he could not do in a prison, without sending up any prayers to the gods, and without saying a word, he made a mockery of his fetters; and again put his leg into them, and continued to behave like men in chains."

The formal trial of Apollonius before Domitian ended in his

acquittal, but he was ordered to remain at Rome till the emperor had conversed with him privately. Apollonius uttered some faithful words to Domitian, told him it was impossible to take his soul, and added, "Not even my body; for as Homer says, 'Not even the deadly spear can slay me, for I am not mortal;' in saying which words, he vanished from the tribunal!" This vanishing took place before mid-day; and on the evening of the same day, Apollonius made his appearance at Puteoli, which was three days' journey from Rome; and whither he had already sent his follower Damis. From Puteoli he went to Sicily and Greece, where he was more honoured than ever. He visited the cave of Trophonius at Lebadea, and conversed with the oracle, or the god. At Ephesus he saw the murder of Domitian, which occurred at Rome, and just at the moment when it happened, he cried out, "Strike the tyrant! Strike!" He then declared the death of the emperor:—"Keep up your spirits, O Ephesians, for this day the tyrant is killed! and why do I say this day? At this very moment, while the words are in my mouth, I swear it by Minerva, the deed is done." This announcement was, in due course, confirmed. Domitian's successor, Nerva, invited Apollonius to Rome, but the invitation was not accepted. The Tyanean indicated obscurely that he should soon leave the world, and that Nerva would not reign long.

Damis was now sent to Rome with messages to Nerva, and Apollonius disappeared from the world. "Concerning the manner of his death, if he did die," says Philostratus; "there are various accounts. Damis says not a word about it." Some said he died at Ephesus; some that he entered the temple of Minerva at Lindus, and there disappeared; others, that while in Crete he entered a temple of Diana, and disappeared. This latter story is thus told:—

"This temple is under the protection of dogs, who take care of the riches laid up in it. These dogs are supposed by the Cretans to be of a breed not inferior to that of bears, or other wild beasts. Whenever Apollonius entered the temple, these dogs did not bark at him, but received him with as much fawning affection as they would have done their most familiar friends. The priests who had the care of the temple seeing this, seized him at his entrance, and bound him, as if he was not only a magician but a robber, saying he had given them a sop to tame them. About midnight he freed himself from his chains, and called those who had bound him in them, to shew he did nothing in secret, then running to the gates of the temple, he found them open. As soon as he entered them, they shut of themselves as they had been before, and the temple resounded with the singing of many virgins, the burden of whose song

was, 'Leave the earth, come to heaven—come—come,' which seemed as if they said, 'Proceed from earth to heaven.' "

A story is also added of a young man who had a vision of Apollonius philosophizing, after his dream, of the soul's immortality.

M. Chassang adds to his version a translation of the letters of Apollonius, as they are called; but as they are in all likelihood spurious, we shall say nothing here about them. What we have said will enable the reader to guess the kind of hero depicted by Philostratus. He is intended to appear as a great genius, a man of universal information, and of more than human powers: traveller, philosopher, philanthropist, and miracle-worker. The analogies between this history and that of the gospels are really few and unimportant. In a literary point of view, there is no resemblance whatever between the simple and artless works of the evangelists, and of the rhetorician who wrote to amuse and gratify Julia Domna. There are some points of contrast however which must not all be passed over. One is, the glaring absurdities of the story of Apollonius; a second, its inconsistency with known facts; and a third its want of support in concurrent testimony. There is no certain indication of the chronology of Apollonius' life, although Olearius has laboured hard to frame one; and concludes, that he was born B.C. 2 or 3, and died A.D. 96. The absurdities and inconsistencies of the book have been discussed at length by various writers, among whom Du Pin deserves to be specially mentioned for his *Histoire d'Apollonius convaincue de fausseté*. Moreri sums up Du Pin's arguments, by saying he proves: 1. That the history of Apollonius is destitute of witnesses deserving of credit. 2. That Philostratus has not written a true history, but a romance. 3. That the miracles attributed to Apollonius have the marks of falsehood; and that there is not one which cannot be ascribed to accident, address, or fraud. 4. That the doctrine of this philosopher is, in many things, contrary to right reason and wisdom. Du Pin regards the account of the journey to India as little better than a tissue of fictions, and he is right. Philostratus, in much that he writes, is evidently striving to excite the surprise of his readers, by exaggerating the circumstances he narrates, and especially by enveloping the person of Apollonius in so much mystery, that it is difficult to say whether he is to be called a man, a demon, or a god. The geography of Philostratus abounds in falsehoods and impossibilities, as Du Pin has noticed. The gift of what we may call second sight claimed for Apollonius, has been claimed by many enthusiasts and impostors in all ages: in modern times by Swedenborg, and the

spiritualists, but it has always been repudiated by true faith and real science. The expulsion from Ephesus of a demon which caused the pestilence, is contradictory to reason; and the same is true of a number of other items, in which the supernatural element appears. Probably the greater part of these are simply fictions invented by Philostratus. To enumerate all the objectionable passages in the book, would be to enumerate hundreds. It must suffice to have mentioned a few.

Now, if Apollonius figured so prominently in all, or nearly all, the first century, in all the lands which laid any claim to civilization, why do we not find his name in any writer of the century? Rome, and Greece, and Egypt, are as silent as Asia Minor, Syria, and the East. Later on, Lucian makes two passing allusions to him, and Apuleius one. The authorities named by Philostratus may be as much the creatures of his imagination as one half of his so-called facts. No doubt, the book of Philostratus was popular, and all who name Apollonius from that time were no doubt mainly indebted to it. Hierocles dragged it into the arena of controversy; Eusebius destroyed much of its credit in the church; and not till the seventeenth century did it assume any importance again. It is now merely a literary curiosity, whose only use is to illustrate man's craving after the supernatural, and his credulous acceptance of travellers' tales.

The Ninetieth Psalm.—The ninetieth Psalm might be cited as perhaps the most sublime of human composition—the deepest in feeling—loftiest in theological conception—the most magnificent in its imagery. True is it in its report of human life—as troubled, transitory, and sinful. True in its conceptions of the Eternal—the Sovereign and the judge; and yet the refuge and hope of men, who, notwithstanding the most severe trials of their faith, lose not their confidence in Him; but who, in the firmness of faith, pray for, as if they were predicting, a near-at-hand season of refreshment. Wrapped, one might say, in mystery, until the distant day of revelation should come, there is here conveyed the doctrine of immortality; for in this very plaint of the brevity of the life of man, and of the sadness of these, his few years of trouble, and their brevity, and their gloom, is brought into contrast the Divine immutability, and yet it is in terms of a submissive piety; the thought of a life eternal is here in embryo. No taint is there in this Psalm of the pride and petulance—the half-uttered blasphemy—the malign disputing or arrangement of the justice or goodness of God, which have so often shed a venomous colour upon the language of those who have writhed in anguish, personal or relative. There are few probably among those who have passed through times of bitter and distracting woe, or who have stood the helpless spectators of the miseries of others, that have not fallen into moods of mind violently in contrast with the devout and hopeful melancholy which breathes throughout this ode. Rightly attributed to the Hebrew law-giver or not, it bespeaks its remote antiquity, not merely by the majestic simplicity of its style, but negatively, by the entire avoidance of those sophisticated turns of thought which belong to a late, a lost age in peoples' intellectual and moral history. This Psalm, undoubtedly, is centuries older than the moralizing of that time when the Jewish mind had listened to what it could never bring into a true assimilation to its own mind, the abstractions of the Greek philosophy.—*Isaac Taylor.*

THE BIBLICAL CANON.*

WE embrace the opportunity afforded by the appearance of Dr. Gaussen's work to state a few facts respecting the Bible canon. In carrying out our intention, we shall intersperse our statements of fact with such observations as may be of service to general readers. The subject is one of confessedly great importance and of universal interest; but it is at the same time one of considerable extent, and to discuss it thoroughly would require a much larger space than we can devote to it. The chief differences of opinion in regard to the canon now, are of course, those between the Romish and the Protestant communities, and these refer exclusively to the Old Testament. But apart from these differences, it is desirable that we should be well aware of the grounds on which we receive the several books of the canon as specified in our confessions of faith, and as represented in our ordinary Bibles. We must treat this matter rather historically than otherwise, and not discuss the claims of the several books to inspiration. When and by whom were the books of Daniel, Esther, and Canticles received? When and by whom have the epistles of James and Jude, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Apocalypse been received? When and by whom have the books we call Apocryphal been rejected?

The word *canon*, as is well known, signifies *a rule*, and the canonical books are so called because they constitute our rule of faith and worship. This mode of designating the Scriptures is ancient and natural, and our work will be to ask *what books* have from the beginning borne this appellation. We shall have to go to the oldest sources of information; and these are ancient versions and manuscripts, the writings of early fathers and others, and such special lists as have been adopted by the councils of the church.

Commencing with the Peshito-Syriac version of the New Testament, we find a canon which is admitted to go back at least to some time—probably the first half—in the second century; some think it belongs to the close of the first century. This version contains none but canonical books, but it was without the epistles of Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and the Apocalypse. At a later period, it is really unknown when, the missing books were added. According to some they were taken from the so-called Philoxenian version, made about A.D. 620. This, however, must be a mistake, as the books in question differ in

^a *The Canon of the Holy Scriptures, from the double point of view of Science and of Faith.* By L. Gaussen, D.D., Geneva. London: Nisbet & Co., 1862.

their style very widely from the Philoxenian. Dr. Thiersch is convinced that the Apocalypse originally formed part of the Peshito version, and that the researches of Hug have left no doubt upon the subject.

The next undoubted witness is Origen, who supplies us with two lists of the canonical books. In his commentary on Joshua, he enumerates all the books of the New Testament as received by us. According to Eusebius, however, Origen did not place all these books on exactly the same level, but distinguished the deutero-canonical books, viz., Hebrews, James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and the Apocalypse. With respect to the Hebrews, the question was probably rather one of authorship than of canonicity. The testimony of Eusebius himself, early in the fourth century, accords with that of Origen. There was still a question in regard to the five brief epistles already enumerated, and consequently he describes them as controverted; but he places the Apocalypse and the Hebrews among the books that were uncontroverted. From all this it is apparent that the books whose claim to canonicity was respected, even when some of those books were placed in the second rank, were the same books as we now receive. The mass of apocryphal rubbish bearing hallowed names is unrecognized by any who take the pains to enumerate the books which, more or less, generally were admitted into the New Testament canon.

There is a passage in Jerome where it is indicated that the Council of Nice was reported to have admitted the book of Judith into the canon. From this meagre and vague statement certain modern writers have inferred that the first general council passed a decree fixing the canon of Scripture. The reason of this is evident: they are anxious to find some official decision of recognized authority. But the inference is worthless. No ancient record exists containing the slightest allusion to such a decree of the Nicene Council. One thing however is noticeable; that after the council we have no more distinction between the New Testament books, which from that date to this have been uniformly twenty-seven, neither more nor fewer. Additions to certain manuscripts do not disprove this assertion. Such additions are too common and different, and too often confronted or explained by positive statements to leave any doubt as to the claims set up for them.

Dr. Gaussen enumerates eleven catalogues as authentic in the fourth century, without counting that of Eusebius. Of these eleven catalogues, nine have been left by the fathers and two by the councils. Three of the lists omit the Apocalypse; viz., the list of Cyril of Jerusalem, who died in A.D. 386; that of Gregory

of Nazianzus; and that of Philastrius. With regard to the New Testament, Cyril says:—

“There are four gospels, all the rest being false and pernicious. The Manichæans, too, have written a gospel according to Thomas, which, under the perfume, so to speak, of an evangelical surname, leads the souls of the simple to perdition. But receive likewise the Acts of the twelve apostles, and also the seven Catholic Epistles of James and Peter, John and Jude; and lastly, as a seal put on all the disciples, the fourteen Epistles of Paul. But let all the other books be placed outside, and classed in a secondary rank. As to all such books as are neither read nor recognized in the Churches, neither read nor recognize them as far as thou art concerned.”

Cyril, it may be added, while he left out the Apocalypse from the New Testament, omitted the Apocrypha from the Old, for he explicitly adopts the Jewish enumeration of the Old Testament, by calling its books *twenty-two*. Gregory Nazianzen resembles him in both these particulars, in his poem on the genuine books of inspired Scripture, where he says he gives two-and-twenty books of the Old Testament corresponding to the Hebrew alphabet. His list of New Testament books is without the Apocalypse; but this book is elsewhere quoted by him in his writings. Philastrius reckons all the New Testament books except the Revelation, and he says of the Apocryphal books, that “though they ought to be read by advanced Christians for edification, they ought not to be read by all; because heretics, ignorant of the truth, have added or retrenched many things as they thought proper.”

The other six catalogues of the fathers of the fourth century contain the Apocalypse. In Dr. Gaussen’s work they are thus described:—

“1. That of Athanasius the Great, who was only twenty-six years younger than Eusebius.

“2. That of another contemporary father whose name is unknown to us.

“3. That of Epiphanius, archbishop of Cyprus, only fourteen years (or according to others only four years) younger than Athanasius.

“4. That of Jerome, secretary to Damasus, bishop of Rome, and thirty-five years younger than Epiphanius.

“5. That of Rufinus, a presbyter of Aquileia, the intimate friend of Jerome before becoming his adversary, and, like him versed in the literature both of the East and the West, owing to his residence at Jerusalem from 371, and at Rome from 396.

“6. That of Augustine, the holy bishop of Hippo, twenty-three years younger than Jerome.”

The list of Athanasius is to be found in the Greek fragment

of the festal epistle contained in his works. Now assuming the genuineness of this fragment, its importance must be very considerable ; for although it may be depreciated as expressing the opinion of one man, it is for us to remember that that man was Athanasius, the same Athanasius who rendered such immense service at the Council of Nice ; the Athanasius whose name was so great, that it was given to a creed which he never compiled, but which is used by Romanists as well as Protestants to this day. What, then, does Athanasius say ? He says :—

“ But since we have made mention of the heretics as of the dead, and of ourselves as having the divine Scriptures unto salvation, I fear lest, as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, a few of the sincere should wander from their simplicity and holiness, through the craft of certain men, and should begin to adopt other (books), deceived by the similarity of the names of the true books and those which are called Apocrypha. I beseech you to be patient, if concerning what you understand, of the same as your monitor I write, because of the need and advantage of the Church. And while I am about to mention these things, I will use for support of my boldness the example of the evangelist Luke, who says, that since some have undertaken to draw up for themselves things which are called apocryphal, and to intermingle the same with divinely-inspired Scripture, concerning which we have full persuasion, as those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word delivered to our fathers, it seemed good also to me who am exhorted thereto by my real brothers, and who have been instructed in order from the beginning to set forth what books have been admitted to the canon, and received, and believed to be divine. I do this that each who has been deceived may recognize his errors ; and that he who continues pure may rejoice when he is again reminded.

“ Now of the Old Testament, the whole number of the books is *twenty-two* ; for as I have heard, there are so many letters in the Hebrew language. In order and name each stands thus : first Genesis, then Exodus, then Leviticus, and after this Numbers, and then Deuteronomy. Following these is Joshua and Judges, and after this Ruth. And again in order four books of Kings, of which the first and second are counted for one book, and the third and fourth likewise for one. After these come Chronicles 1 and 2, similarly counted for one book. Then Ezra 1 and 2, similarly as one. Then come the book of Psalms, and the Proverbs next ; then Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs ; Job and the prophets succeed these. The prophets are twelve, who are counted one book ; and then Isaiah, Jeremiah, and with him Baruch, Lamentations, and the Epistle. After him come Ezekiel and Daniel, by which the Old Testament is concluded.

“ Of the books of the New Testament, moreover, we shall not be slow to speak, for they are these : the four Gospels according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, and according to John. After these are the Acts of the Apostles, and seven so-called Catholic epistles of the apostles, thus : 1 and 2 Peter, three of John, and after these Jude.

Of Paul the apostle there are fourteen epistles, in order written thus : first, to the Romans, next, two to the Corinthians, after this to the Galatians, then to the Ephesians, then to the Philippians and to the Colossians, and after these, two to the Thessalonians and that to the Hebrews, following which are two to Timothy, one to Titus, and last of all, that to Philemon, and the Apocalypse of John.

“These are the wells of salvation, so that he who thirsts can be abundantly supplied with the oracles that are in them. In these alone is the doctrine of religion declared. Let no one add to these, nor take away from these. Concerning these, the Lord put the Sadducees to shame, saying, ‘Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures;’ and he exhorts the Jews, ‘Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me.’ But for the sake of greater exactness, I add, and writing this is necessary, that there are also other books apart from these, not canonical, but signified by the fathers to be read to those who come forward and wish to be instructed in the subject of religion. The Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther, and Judith, and Tobit, and that called the doctrine of the apostles and the pastor. And yet, beloved, the appellation of Apocrypha does not at all belong to those which are canonical and to these which may be read; but it is an opinion of the heretics who write the same things when they will, both giving out and adding times for the same, in order that by uttering them as ancient, they may by this means have a pretext for deceiving the simple.”

Upon this passage many remarks might be made; but we cannot discuss it at length. One thing, however, seems evident, which is, that there was a clear distinction even then between canonical and uncanonical books. It will also be noticed, that Athanasius gives a list of the New Testament books altogether agreeing with our own. As to the Old Testament, he excludes the book of Esther, and places it among the books which may be read, but are not canonical. He reckons in the same category the doctrine of the apostles and the pastor of Hermas. In both these respects he differs alike from the Romish and the Protestant church. He accepts the second book of Esdras, Baruch, and the epistle of Jeremiah as canonical, but rejects Tobit and Judith equally with the Wisdom of Solomon and the Wisdom of Sirach. Several books now included in the Romish canon are not mentioned at all. It is manifest that he knew of no decision of the council of Nice admitting the book of Judith into the canon. Although, then, this document may be pleaded in favour of one or two Apocryphal books, it is much more in favour of the Protestant than of the Popish canon.

There is among the works of Athanasius a Synopsis of holy Scripture, which, although admitted not to be his, is of great antiquity and value. It agrees in the main with the list already quoted; comprising two books of Esdras or Ezra, apocryphal

additions to Daniel and Jeremiah, and placing Esther, Judith, Tobit, Wisdom, and Sirach among the Apocrypha or uncanonical books. A supplemental list contains the names of the books which were contradicted or antilegomena. For the Old Testament they are Wisdom, Sirach, Esther, Judith, and Tobit, four books of Maccabees, the Ptolemaics, the Psalms and hymns of Solomon, and the history of Susanna. The Apocrypha of the Old Testament are the book of Enoch, the Patriarchs, the Prayer of Joseph, the Testament of Moses, the Assumption of Moses, the books of Abraham, of Eldad and Modad, of Elijah, of Zachariah the father of John, of Baruch, and books falsely ascribed to Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The Apocrypha of the New Testament are, the travels of Peter, travels of John, travels of Thomas, gospel of Thomas, doctrine of the Apostles, and the Clementines. From these, it is added, some selections may be read as more true and divinely inspired. The use of *θεόπνευστα* here, shews how loosely the word was sometimes used.

The next writer mentioned by Dr. Gaussen is Epiphanius, whose catalogue of the New Testament books is to be found in his *Panarium*, or treatise against heresies. His enumeration need not detain us, as it is in all respects the same as our own. But it is to be noticed, that in describing the Old Testament, he mentions twenty-seven books, observing at the same time that the Hebrews reckon only twenty-two. How he makes the larger number, does not appear, but after naming the books of the New Testament, he specifies the two books of Wisdom, that of Solomon, and that of the son of Sirach. It is clear from other allusions that he considered these books as ecclesiastical, and permitted to be read, although controverted.

The fourth list is that of Jerome, and it appears in more forms than one. For the New Testament he agrees with us, although he notices that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not universally received among the Latins. His well-known *Prologus Galeatus* deserves to be mentioned. Herein he reckons the books of the Old Testament at twenty-two, and the enumeration comprehends the books which we receive, for there is no doubt that his two-fold book of Ezra includes our Ezra and Nehemiah. In his letter to Paulinus, Jerome notes all the books of Scripture, exactly as in our Bibles. His prefaces to Tobit and Judith shew that he did not regard them as canonical, and the same is true of the various additions to Daniel and Jeremiah, and the books of Wisdom. In his preface to the books of Solomon, he mentions the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach, and he says:—"Sicut ergo

Judith, et Tobię, et Macchabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed *eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recepit*; sic et hæc duo volumina legat ad ædificationem plebis *non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam*:" that is, "As therefore the Church reads indeed the books of Judith and Tobit, and of the Maccabees, but *does not receive* them among the canonical Scriptures, so also it may read these two volumes for the edification of the people, not for confirming the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas." Language cannot be plainer than this, and the compilers of the Thirty-nine Articles took care to use it in drawing up the sixth article. Such are the views of St. Jerome himself, the man to whom the Latin church owes the Vulgate version which the Council of Trent has decreed authentic. Jerome little thought that the day would come when a general council would anathematize the opinions he had advanced.

From Jerome we pass to Rufinus, of whom we will only say that his list of the New Testament books is the same as our own; and that he thus speaks of what we call apocryphal:—"There are, besides these, other books that were called by the ancients not *canonical*, but *ecclesiastical*. Such are the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach the book of Tobit, that of Judith, and the books of the Maccabees."

Our next authority is Augustine, for whom we freely express our admiration, although we are deeply conscious that he is sometimes obscure, and at other times inconsistent. Upon the canon of the New Testament, he is both clear and consistent; and we may learn something from him in reference to the Old Testament. In one of his latest works, and one which contains much that is deserving of attention, the eighth chapter of the third book is headed, "*Libri Canonici*," and herein he says:—

"Now, in reference to the canonical Scriptures of the Catholic churches, he should follow the authority of as many as possible, among whom are those who merited to have apostolic sees, and to receive epistles. He will therefore hold this course with canonical Scriptures, that he will prefer those which are accepted by all churches, before those which do not receive some of them. But among those which are not accepted by all, he will prefer those which the majority and the more influential receive, to those which are received by fewer churches and of less authority. Now, if he finds some accepted by the larger churches and others by the weightier, although he cannot discover it, yet I think they should be held as of equal authority. The whole canon of Scriptures, wherein this consideration is to be exercised, is contained in these books; five of Moses, that is Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; and one book of Joshua (Jesus Nave), one of Judges, one which is called Ruth, which seems more to belong to the beginnings of the Kingdoms; then four of the Kingdoms and two of Chronicles, not in regular order, but as it

were added by the side and running parallel. This is the history which contains the annals belonging to it, and the course of events. There are others, as if of a different order, which are neither connected with this series, nor with one another; as are Job, and Tobit, and Esther, and Judith, and the two books of Maccabees, and two books of Ezra, which seem rather to follow after the regular history till it is terminated by the Kingdoms or Chronicles. Next the prophets, among which are David's one book of Psalms, and Solomon's three books of Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. For the two books, the one called Wisdom and the other Ecclesiasticus, are said to be Solomon's because of a certain resemblance. For Jesus, son of Sirach, is most commonly reported to have written them. Yet, because they have deserved to be received into authority, they are to be enumerated among the prophetic books. The rest are the books of those who are properly called prophets, separate books by twelve prophets, these, connected together, and never separated, are counted for one. Of these prophets, the names are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Then come four prophets of larger extent, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel. By these forty-four books, the authority of the Old Testament is limited. The New Testament includes the gospel in four books, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; fourteen epistles of Paul, viz., to the Romans; two to the Corinthians; Galatians; Ephesians; Philippians; two to the Thessalonians; Colossians; two to Timothy; Titus, Philemon and Hebrews; two epistles of Peter; three of John; one of Jude; and one of James; the Acts of the Apostles in one book, and the Apocalypse of John in one book."

In this form we have received the conclusions of Augustine; and, so far as the New Testament is concerned, they are every way satisfactory. Augustine, however, while he receives every book of the Old Testament which we account canonical, receives also several which by us are designated apocryphal, and which Jerome himself just before had refused to admit into the canon. The two books of Ezra are, we presume, Ezra and Nehemiah, and therefore owned by us; but he plainly endorses Tobit, and Judith, and two books of Maccabees, and reckons Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus among the prophecies. He explains nothing in regard to the additions made to Esther, to Daniel, and to Jeremiah. The ancient writers, who had spoken of the canon, had regularly called the Old Testament books *twenty-two*, according to the number of the Hebrew letters; it is only occasionally that this number is departed from. Augustine however, with his customary daring, declares them *forty-four*, doubling them at a stroke. After this time, we fear there are not many writers who limit the number to twenty-two. The ecclesiastical books of Jewish origin or character won for themselves a lasting place, and we find them incorporated in Bible manuscripts with such

as were always considered canonical. They are in Codex A., in Codex B., and in the recently-found Codex Sinaiticus. The occurrence of some of these Apocrypha is uniform, but of others casual; and therefore when a decree was drawn up at the Tridentine Council, a selection was made: some were retained among the sheep, others were classed with the goats.

We have still several other catalogues of the New Testament which claim an early date, and which we must therefore say a few words about. The first is what is called the Catalogue of Innocent I., who belongs to the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth. This list occurs in what affects to be an Epistle to Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, which, in a copy before us, appears with the title "*Decreta Innocentii Pape*," (Ed. Coloniae, 1530). For the convenience of the reader we copy it:—

"Qui vero libri recipiantur in canone sanctarum Scripturarum brevis annexus ostendit. Hæc sunt ergo quæ desiderata moneri voce voluisti, Moysi libri 5, id est Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium, necnon et Jesu Nave, et Judicum, et Regnorum libri quatuor, simul et Ruth, prophetarum libri sedecim, Salomonis libri quinque; Psalterium; item historiarum Job liber unus, Hester unus, Judith unus, Machabæorum duo, Esdræ duo, Paralipomenon duo: item Novi Testamenti evangeliorum libri quatuor, Pauli Apostoli epistolæ 14, epistolæ Johannis quatuor, epistolæ Petri duæ, epistola Judæ, epistola Jacobi, Actus Apostolorum, Apocalypsis Johannis. Cætera autem sub nomine Mathiæ, sive Jacobi Minoris, et sub nomine Petri, et Johannis, quæ à quodam Lentio scripta sunt, vel sub nomine Andræ, quæ à Nexocharidæ et Leonida philosophis, et sub nomine Thomæ, et si qua sunt alia non solum non aspicienda, verumetiam noverit esse damnanda."

This document professes to have been written when Stilico and Anthemius were consuls, or in A.D. 405.

The list which bears the name of Damasus is, with some variations, also ascribed to Gelasius and Hormisdas. It contains the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, but also comprises some apocryphal books. It is, undoubtedly, spurious, and need not detain us. We may notice, however, that in an old copy under the name of Gelasius, one book of Ezra is named, Nehemiah wholly omitted, and one book of Maccabees only set down. The variations in these spurious lists are frequent, and we must not wonder, therefore, to find in the list credited to Innocent four epistles of John.

Another catalogue bears the name of Amphilochius of Iconium; Dr. Gaussen regards it as at least Apocryphal, if not spurious. It, however, comprises all the canonical books of the

New Testament. Amphilochius, whose name it appears under, died in or about A.D. 395.

We now come to two catalogues, said to have been drawn up at the councils of Laodicea and Carthage,—the one in the middle of the fourth century, and the other at its end.

It is uncertain exactly when the synod of Laodicea was held. The canons passed by it are either fifty-nine or sixty. The most ancient authorities give but fifty-nine, and omit the one which contains the canon. The fifty-ninth canon is that “Private psalms and uncanonical books ought not to be read in the church, but only the canonical books of the old and New Testament.” The so-called sixtieth canon begins, “What books of the Old Testament ought to be read;” and the list follows, containing all the canonical books of Scripture. But among those of the Old Testament, we find “Jeremiah and Baruch, Lamentations and epistles.” Ezra 1 and 2 are, of course, Ezra and Nehemiah. No other trace of Apocryphal books occurs. The list is, therefore, undoubtedly ancient; but is it genuine? Bishop Cousin rejects it, and so do many others. We are decidedly of their opinion, because we cannot imagine that so important a list would have been omitted from the early copies, if it ought to have been in them. Dr. Gaussen is inclined, and all but resolved, to pronounce for its genuineness. We may remark that, in some old Latin copies, the list does not include two books of Ezra, and does not mention either Baruch, Lamentations, or epistles; in fact, it contains none but canonical books, and omits the names of two (Nehemiah and Lamentations) that are canonical. It is no doubt a valuable and very early record, but we cannot think it emanated from the Laodicean council. It reduces the number of Old Testament books to twenty-two, and the mention of Baruch even does not prove that the book now so-called is meant, for the reference may only be to a portion of what we include in Jeremiah.

The canon ascribed to a council, said to have been held at Carthage in A.D. 397, contains several Apocryphal books. The canon in question is the forty-seventh, which, in an old Latin copy, runs to this effect:—

“Item placuit ut præter Scripturas canonicas, nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum Scripturarum. Sunt autem canonicæ Scripturæ i. primus Genesis, secundus Exodus, tertius Leviticus, quartus Numeri, quintus Deuteronomium, sextus Jesus Nave, septimus Judicum, octavus Ruth, nonus Regum, libri 4; Paralipomenon, libri duo; Job unus, Psalterium Davidicum, Salomonis, libri 5; libri duodecim prophetarum, Esaias, Hieremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Tobias, Judith, Hester, Esdre, libri 2; Machab, libri 2. Novi autem Testamenti, 27; Evangeliorum, libri 4;

Actuum apostolorum, liber unus; Pauli apostoli epistolæ, 14; ejusdem ad Hebræos, una; Petri apostoli, duæ; Johannis apostoli, tres; Judæ apostoli, una; et Jacobi, una; Apocalypsis Johannis, liber unus, qui sunt 27. Hoc etiam fratri et consacerdoti nostro Bonifacio vel aliis earum partium episcopis pro confirmando isto canone innotescat, quia a patribus ista accepimus in ecclesia legenda, liceat etiam legi passiones martyrum cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrentur.

We have copied this canon, because we think it carries its condemnation upon its face. Not only is it not connected or uniform in structure with those which precede and follow it, but the reference to Boniface is an anachronism, and savours of a stupid attempt to inveigle an appeal to the see of Rome. More than this, canon forty-eight contains a similar appeal to Siricius, who preceded Boniface by twenty years or more. Finally, we may notice how, as if by an afterthought, the acts of the martyrs are allowed; as if they also were canonical Scripture, or were worthy of a place by the side of it. For our part, we do not believe the canon genuine; and there are texts in which it forms part of the canons of a subsequent council. It may, we are persuaded, be confidently referred to a later date than 397, and therefore we may for the present dismiss it without further remark.

Here we may introduce the list contained in what is commonly called the eighty-fifth of the Apostolical Canons, but which are known to be a later composition. The following is from the Paris, 1618, edition of Zonaras:—

“To all you clergy and laity let the books be venerable and holy. Of the Old Testament, five of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Joshua one, Judges one, Ruth one, Kingdoms four, Chronicles of the book of Days two, Ezra two, Esther one, Maccabees three, Job one, Psalter one, Solomon three,—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs; twelve prophets, Isaiah one, Jeremiah one, Ezekiel one, Daniel one. Besides these, let there be given to your young men to learn, the Wisdom of the very learned Sirach. Now ours, that is the New Testament, are four gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; fourteen epistles of Paul, two of Peter, three of John, one of James, one of Jude, two epistles of Clement, and the Constitutions addressed to you bishops by me, Clement, in eight books, which ought not to be published among all because of the mysteries in them, and the Acts of us the Apostles.”

Zonaras observes that some other lists, besides the books here enumerated, also allow to be read, the Wisdom of Solomon, Judith, Tobit, and the Apocalypse of the Divine. There are sundry variations in the copies of this canon, which is, moreover, one of those which have been added to the original

collection. Its age is uncertain, and its authority is admitted by nobody.

The last catalogue we shall now mention is a more ancient and important one, unhappily not perfect; we mean the canon of Muratori, so called from its discoverer. It claims to belong to the middle of the second century, but its real age is disputed. It is not only imperfect, but confused, and badly written. It recognizes the gospels and Acts, *thirteen* epistles of Paul, and the Apocalypse; one epistle of Jude and two of John, the book of Wisdom, and the Apocalypse of Peter. It notices that some refuse the Apocalypses of John and Peter, and it rejects the pastor of Hermas and some other books. Clearly its principal value is its recognition of most of the antilegomena, and its omission of Hebrews.

A considerable number of facts still remain unnoticed, and we shall therefore return to the subject in a subsequent paper. In the meantime we may confidently recommend to our readers the work of Dr. Gaussen, of which we have made free use. The historical parts of the work are particularly worthy of attention. The first division of it, "The Method of Science," occupies ground which few will be inclined to dispute. The second part, "The Method of Faith," opens up a field where there is more room for controversy. The appendix, on the Apocrypha, also merits a careful examination, as the subject is one which requires delicate handling.

The reader will see from the facts we have already thrown together, that there was by no means perfect unity of opinion in the first four centuries as it regards the canon. These and other facts yet to be adduced will show, unless we are mistaken:—1. That originally the canon of the Old Testament was in the Christian Church the same as the Jews received, and we now hold; but that gradually Apocryphal additions were made to it. 2. That the canon of the New Testament was at first unsettled, that its formation was gradual, and that all questions in regard to it were hardly settled before the end of the fourth century, when it almost universally assumed the form in which we now receive it.



MARCUS ANTONINUS A PERSECUTOR.^a

Introductory Remarks.

[WALTER MOYLE, Esq., the author of the following letter, was born in Cornwall in 1672. He studied at Oxford with remarkable success, after which he removed to the Temple. He was an industrious and accomplished scholar, and distinguished himself by various productions of the pen, which confirmed the opinions framed upon his conversation, that he was likely to take a leading place among the literati of his time. At about the age of thirty he entered parliament. He died in 1721. Two volumes of his unpublished works were printed in 1726, edited by Thomas Serjeant; and in 1727 his published works were printed in a separate volume with a memoir, by A. H. (Anthony Hammond). What we are now most concerned to notice is, that Mr. Moyle wrote a curious and elaborate refutation of the story of the *Thundering Legion* as given by Eusebius (H. E., v. 5). This refutation began with a summary statement of the arguments, in a letter to the Rev. Mr. King, of Topsham. A lengthened correspondence was the result, and this may be seen in the second volume of Mr. Moyle's posthumous works. This correspondence was translated by Mosheim, and used by Lardner. In connexion with it the following letter was addressed to Mr. King, but for some reason it is not contained in Mr. Moyle's collected works. It was printed in the *Theological Repository*, we suppose by Dr. Priestley, from a copy which had been made for Dr. Lardner. There is in it so much that is interesting, and likely to be useful, that we willingly insert it in these pages. It has always been the case that some will say the wise and excellent pagans were all endowed with the virtue of toleration, and that persecution is pre-eminently a Christian vice. How far the insinuation is just will well enough appear to all who know anything of early church history. But it may not be useless to illustrate somewhat minutely the spirit of pagan philosophy, and for this purpose we know not that we can do better than set forth Mr. Moyle's "Discourse to prove Marcus Antoninus a Persecutor," which here follows.]

^a According to the original plan for this Journal, as drawn up by Dr. Kitto, translations and reprints were included. Translations have been much more frequently introduced than reprints. But there are scattered abroad, essays which well merit republication. Such we believe is the one which we now offer to our readers.

To prove Marcus Antoninus a persecutor, I shall insist on these three propositions:—I. That he was a bigot to his own religion, and no favourer of the Christians. II. That the persecution was carried on with his knowledge and consent. III. That it was carried on by his orders and edicts.

I. *That he was a bigot to his own religion, and no favourer of the Christians.*

1. His bigotry to his own religion appears from the whole tenor of his writings, which are full of the highest reverence and veneration for his own gods: and it would be loss of time to produce examples in so evident a matter. Nor would so violent a pagan as Julian have chosen him for the hero of his *Cæsars*, and made his piety to the gods the shining part of his character, if he had shewn any favourable disposition to the Christians. The nice care and exactness with which he acted in the discharge of his office, while he was one of the *Salii*, is another argument of his zeal (*Capitol.*, chap. iii.), Marcellinus (xxv. 4) makes him religious even to superstition: nor could the heathens of his own age forbear ridiculing him, for the vast number of sacrifices which he offered (*Ib.*). And Dio, as an uncommon instance of his devotion, assures us that he sacrificed to the gods at his own house, even upon cross-days (*Excerpta Valesiana*, p. 721). Another proof of his piety may be drawn from the character of his father Antoninus, whose zeal and religion is cried up by all the historians of those times, who compare him, on that account to Numa, the first founder of their religion. (*Suidas in Antonino*, *Capitolinus in Pio*, chap. ii. 13; *Eutropius*, etc.) And Pausanias (lib. viii., p. 526) who had best reason to know, because he flourished in his reign, assures us that he took the surname of Pius from his singular piety to the gods. Now since M. Antoninus proposes to himself the example of his father, as the model and rule of all his civil and religious actions (lib. vi., chap. xxiii., *M. Casaub. Ed.*), and so often commends him for his piety in adhering to the institutions of his own country (*κατὰ τὰ πάτρια*, i. 13), and for being averse to innovations in religion, and all other matters (*μηδὲ καινοτόμον*, *Ib.*), it follows of course that he acted upon the same principles, and shewed an equal zeal for the Pagan worship. To illustrate this argument, I might insist on his known credulity, and superstition in other matters, his consulting the Chaldeans (*Capitol.*, chap. xix.) and giving credit to the oracles of Alexander the impostor, as I formerly observed; his believing that dreams came from the gods (*Anton.*, lib. ix., chap. xxi.) and his ascribing the cure of his disease to one of them (*Ib.*, i. 1, chap. xiv.) To

which I might add many other fooleries unworthy so great a man, which shew that the noblest genius, and the highest parts, are not proof against invincible prejudice of custom and education.

2. His contempt and hatred of Christianity is as manifest from his own works. In the beginning of his book he ridicules exorcists and pretenders to miracles (lib. i., chap. iii.) And nobody can doubt but the reflection is chiefly, if not solely, levelled at the Christians, who distinguished themselves by their miraculous power in casting out devils. You very well know that there was a particular order in the primitive church set apart for this service, whom Antoninus considered as jugglers and impostors, as Lucian has done in his *Philopseudes*, and Ulpian in the *Digests* (lib. l., tom. 13, chap. i.) What a despicable character has he given of the Christians (lib. xi., chap. iii.), where he describes them as a pack of mad men and enthusiasts, who threw away their lives on no other principle but bare obstinacy? To elude the force of this argument, you alleged that Antoninus in this passage had only the heretics in his eye, who, contrary to the practice of the orthodox, pressed forward to martyrdom with a zeal void of knowledge. To set you right in this mistake, I produced many examples of volunteers among the Catholics; to which I shall add some more out of the third century, when the inconsiderate heat for martyrdom began to cool. Origen, under Severus, earnestly courted, though he missed the crown of martyrdom (Euseb., vi. 2). The same author gives some instances of voluntary martyrs under Decius (v. 41) and Valerian (vii. 12) and even as low as the fourth century under Diocletian's persecution, the old spirit of martyrdom began to revive among the Christians. "In gloriosa certamina ruebatur," says Sulp. Severus (ii. 46). And Eusebius has preserved the memory of several Catholics, who offered themselves willingly to the slaughter (*Hist.*, viii. 9; *De Martyr Palæst.*, chap. iii., iv., ix.) The only instance I can find in all antiquity of a voluntary martyr among the heretics, was of a Marcionite that suffered under Valerian (Euseb., vii. 12), which very happily confirms my explication of Clemens Alexand. in the remarks on your notes. This point is clear beyond all exception, As for the other part of your supposition, I had shewn from Justin and others, that the heretics were far enough from being fond of martyrdom; for which I have now an express authority from Irenæus (Ed. Grabe, p. 361), who says that martyrdom was against the principles of the heretics; and that from the first rise of christianity down to the age he wrote in, which was under Commodus, not above one or two of them had suffered

for their religion. This testimony can never be evaded, and entirely destroys your whole argument. But what service would it do your cause, if I should allow that the bold sufferings of the heretics gave Antoninus a handle for this reflection; for it is plain he applies it to the whole body of the Christians without distinction, and consequently entertained the same opinion of the heretics and the orthodox; which is all I contend for?

3. Antoninus's aversion to Christianity is confirmed by the testimony of Christian writers. Justin, in his first apology, joins him throughout with his father Antoninus Pius, in his hatred to the Christians: and Athenagoras says he abhorred their very name (Oxford edition, p. 7). It is certain that he was bred up from his infancy with a strong prejudice to Christianity, as well by the example and precepts of his father (whose opinion of our religion is very well known from Justin Martyr), as by his education under so many tutors that were enemies to the Christian religion. Diognetus, as we know from his own works (i. 3), took care to season him with early prejudices against Christianity. Apollonius, his preceptor in philosophy, was not only a hater, but a persecutor of the Christians (Epiphan., *Hær.*, lvi.) And Fronto, his rhetoric master, made that virulent invective against the Christians, wherein he accuses them of those foul crimes that were laid to their charge, by the malice of the heathens (*Min. Felix*, pp. 88, 303). To these persons Antoninus continued his kindness and confidence after he came to the crown, and has made honourable mention of them all in his works. He paid a particular regard to Apollonius after he was emperor, and often frequented his lectures (*Capitol.*, chap. iii.) And as for Fronto he advanced him to the government of Britain (*Eumenii Panegy.*, chap. xiii.), and to the consulship (*Aussonii Panegy.*, chap. ccxl., *Scalig. Ed.*), which is a plain proof that he never expressed any favourable opinion of the Christians, otherwise his most intimate friends and favourites would never have professed themselves their open and avowed enemies. I shall conclude this head with an observation of Gerard Vossius, in his notes on the second edict ascribed to Antoninus, that his descent from Numa, to which I may add his character of Pontifex Maximus, or head of the heathen church, might help to confirm him in his bigotry to his own persuasion: and that it is very improbable that such a lover and admirer of the philosophers, sworn enemies of Christianity, could ever entertain the least regard for our religion.

4. The only argument you have brought to prove him a favourer of the Christians, is his letter to the assembly of Asia. In my remarks I have urged several chronological arguments

against the authority of this edict; and I was in hopes before you had asked for new ones you would have answered the old. But I am so willing to end this controversy upon any terms, that I am content, in order to give it the finishing stroke, to try once more, at your request, to set this whole matter in so clear a light, as may, if possible, make you a convert. It is a very ill sign of this edict's being genuine, that the ancient writers are not agreed to what emperor it belongs. Justin's copy, and all the other historians, except the Alexandrian chronicle, give it to Antoninus Pius. So does Eusebius, though the title in his copy plainly ascribes it to M. Antoninus; which last opinion has been followed by all the modern critics, and is by much the more probable. And the wide difference, not only in the title, but in the body of the edict, between the two copies of Eusebius and Justin, is very unaccountable. Perhaps you will say, that the edict being first published in Latin (as it must if it were genuine) these copies are only different translations of the original. This might pass for a good plea, if they varied only in words, and not in sense. But since they disagree in so many material points, and that several sentences are wanting in one that are extant in the other copy, this answer will never solve the difficulty, nor account for such essential variations. Besides, it is very remarkable, that though both copies, especially Justin's, were compared by an ignorant hand, and are written in such corrupt and barbarous Greek, that it is hardly intelligible, yet I cannot discover the least trace of any Latinism in either of them; this must unavoidably appear in all versions from the Latin, where the translator is not a perfect master of his own language, which it is plain these authors were not. This is a good argument that they were originally written in Greek, which is proof enough of their being forgeries; for everybody knows that Greek in those days was not the language of the laws or the court. I had almost forgotten to observe, that notwithstanding the disagreement of those edicts, in some very material circumstances, yet from their resemblance in the main, especially in the enacting clauses, where they are not entirely the same, the critics have very justly concluded that they are not different edicts, but different editions of the same edict. It is hard, at this distance of time, to determine which is the original; but since it is a certain observation that the earliest forgeries are always the grossest, it is most probable that the edition annexed to Justin's apology (though not by himself) is the most ancient. It is very likely, that in course of time, it fell into some hands who thought it too coarse a counterfeit to pass upon the world, and therefore modelled it into a little better shape, and published a new edition

of it, preserved by Eusebius in his history, which is the more plausible of the two, though there are blots enough left for the critics to hit.

5. The disagreement of these copies, with the other circumstances, bear very hard against the authority of this edict: but the argument from the silence of all the writers of those times, is a demonstration against it. Is it possible that so illustrious a testimony could escape the curiosity of all the authors of that age? Could an edict that was publicly set up at Ephesus, as is pretended, be a secret to all the apologists of that time? It is a jest to suppose that Justin and Athenagoras in their apologies addressed to M. Antoninus after the date of this edict, would have taken such pains to vindicate the Christians from imputation of atheism, and other popular calumnies, if the emperor, in so solemn an edict, had acquitted them of that charge. Tatian and Theophilus have passed over this edict in silence; and we may reasonably suppose the same of the other champions of Christianity in that reign, Miltiades, Apollinaris, and Bardesanes; since Eusebius has not appealed to their testimony on this occasion. He has indeed produced the authority of Melito, where he is plainly mistaken, as Valesius rightly observes. Melito, indeed, mentions some edicts of Antoninus Pius, directed to the Greek critics in Europe, but says nothing of any edict addressed to the assembly of Asia, by either of the Antonines: and since he has cited so many edicts of former reigns in favour of the Christians, it is unreasonable to suppose that in an apology inscribed to M. Antoninus he would have omitted the mention of so memorable an edict, if any such had been extant in his time.

6. Thus much I thought necessary to premise, by way of introduction, to my chronological arguments, which I shall now begin with. The title of the edict in Eusebius (which is thought to be the true one by the critics) bears date in the first year of M. Antoninus, to which you agree. Now it is certain that Antoninus, the moment he came to the crown, made his brother Verus partner of the empire; and consequently, were it genuine, it ought to have run in both their names. Nor was the style of Armeniacus, which appears in the head of the edict, assumed by Antoninus, till the third year of his reign; as is plain from the medals: for his victories in Armenia were not won till that year. Pagi, to evade these difficulties, which he was very well aware of, changes the date of the Trib. Pot. from xv. to xxiii., which is coincident with the ninth year of his reign, in which his brother Verus died. But this is an arbitrary correction, unwarranted by any MS., nor will it serve his turn: for if it were published

before the death of Verus, my first argument will conclude as strongly against the ninth as the first year of his reign. If it were published after his death, the difficulty is still as great: for how then comes the style of Armeniacus there; since we are sure from Capitolinus (chap. xii.), that after the death of Verus, he took no other title but that of Germanicus, and quitted all his old ones? Bishop Pearson, by a strange mistake, in confounding the epocha of his Tribunitian with the epocha of his Augustæan power, has set the date of the edict to the fifteenth year of his reign: but this account can never be true, not only for the reason here alleged, and in my defence (art. iv. § 4), but because the surname of Germanicus is omitted in the front of the edict, which appears in all his medals of that year.

7. The past and present earthquakes, in the Proconsular Asia, which the edict takes notice of, are another note of time never to be reconciled to any of the afore-mentioned dates. By the past ones, there is no doubt but the author had in view the great earthquake which did so much mischief in that province under Antoninus Pius. (*Capitol. in Pio.*, c. ix., Pausanias, lib. viii., p. 526, Xiphilin. p. 799.) There appears nothing upon record of any other earthquake, in the Proconsular Asia, under M. Antoninus, except that memorable one which laid Smyrna in ruins, and which all the historians of those times have fixed to the latter end of his reign. Pausanias, who wrote in the fourteenth year of M. Antoninus (p. 287), describes Smyrna as a flourishing city at that time, and says nothing of its suffering by any earthquake. Philostratus (in *Aristide*, p. 579, etc.), places this earthquake after Antoninus's progress into Asia, which was in the sixteenth year of his reign: and Dio (p. 814) sets it near the time of his last expedition against the Sarmatians, which was in the eighteenth year of his reign: and Eusebius's chronicle, and the Alexandrian, fix it to the following year. How well these accounts agree with the edict, I leave you to judge. Upon the whole matter, if you have skill enough to reconcile all these false dates, with other inconsistencies which I need not repeat, I am content you should believe the edict to be genuine. But I hope you will not cut the knot, instead of untying it, as some critics have done, who without any proof reject the title as spurious, though they admit the edict as genuine: as if, by the same rule, I might not as fairly reject the whole for a forgery, it being manifest that the authority of both of them stands upon the same bottom; for the title appears in every MS. of the edict now extant.

8. I shall now pass on to examine the body of the edict, as it stands in both copies of Eusebius and Justin. Nothing is

more dark and abrupt than the beginning. The very first sentence, in both copies, has a relative in it, *τοιούτους*, which refers to no antecedent. *In medias res, non secus ac notas auditorem rapit*, may be a good rule in poetry: but is it the style of business and the laws? You will say, perhaps, it refers to a letter, the assembly of Asia had writ the emperor, to consult him on the subject of the Christians. But this does not appear from the edict; and Eusebius is so far from saying any thing like it, that on the contrary, he assures us the edict was issued forth on the application of the Christians in Asia, in order to stop the persecution in that province, without giving us the least hint that it was written in answer to any letter of that assembly. In the next period the emperor says, the gods would punish such persons, if they were able. An excellent compliment to his gods! Did he question their omnipotence? was not Jupiter omnipotent as common a phrase among the heathen, as God Almighty with us? Tertullian indeed (*ad Nationes*, chap. 10) says *Non irascerentur (Dii) vobis in animadversione (Christianorum) cessantibus, si ipsi exequi possent*. This is right, and sounds well from a Christian; but was ever such stuff put into the mouth of a heathen emperor? That sentence in Tacitus (ann. i., 73) to which the impostor seems to allude, *Deorum injurias diis esse curæ*, is a noble maxim against persecution, and a just thought: for it does not dispute the power of the gods to avenge their own wrong. The words indeed, *εἴπερ δύναιτο* are struck out of Eusebius's copy, which was very well thought of.

9. In the foregoing period, the heathens are blamed for accusing the Christians of atheism, and (as Justin's copy adds) other crimes, that could not be proved against them. But is it to be imagined that Athenagoras would have begged the emperor, in such pressing terms, to give no credit to those popular curnies of atheism, etc., if he had long before so solemnly pronounced them innocent of that charge? Would Justin (*Apol.* 2.) after so open a declaration of the emperor, have challenged Crescens, who had accused the Christians of atheism, to a public disputation, in his presence, in order to vindicate their innocence? It is ridiculous to suppose, that so memorable a testimony in favour of the Christians, could have been missed by all the succeeding apologists of the second and third century, to a man, unless Tertullian may be thought to allude to this edict, in his apology, as I have observed in my defence (art. iv. § 1), whose authority, were it express, would be of little weight against the universal silence of the rest, who would certainly have appealed to it, had they believed it genuine.

10. The next sentence is a very masterly one, in which both copies, though they vary in words, agree in sense; for I know no difference between *χρήσιμον* and *αἰρετὸν*, a thing profitable, or a thing to be desired or chosen. It is the interest of the Christian (says the mock emperor) rather to suffer for their God than, etc. This must relate to their interest here or hereafter. It would be a pleasant paradox to suppose that the Christians had any temporal interest in being hanged or burnt for their religion. If it relates, as it certainly must, to another life, it carries a double absurdity along with it: first, in making a heathen suppose that the professors of a false religion (as every heathen must think the Christians) were rewarded with happiness in another world; and, in the next place, it is directly contrary to the principles of Antoninus, who, with the later Stoics, believed the mortality of the soul, and, consequently, denied a future state (*Anton.*, iv. 13). By following the version and reading of Langius, which is confirmed, as Valesius observes, by several of the MSS. I have given this sentence a fairer turn in my translation, than the words will bear in the printed copies. For it is nonsense to suppose that the Christians could have any interest to seem to die for their religion, unless they really did. There the emperor, you see, owns they died for their gods; and in the next period adds, that by virtue of this principle (*ὅθεν*) they triumphed over the cruelty of their persecutors. The sense is much the same in Justin's copy. Now I would fain know how this is consistent with his character of the Christian martyrs (*Lib.* xi., chap. iii.), there he says they died upon no other motive but a spirit of obstinacy,^b in this he applauds their constancy. How came Antoninus so well acquainted, in the beginning of his reign, with the true motive of their suffering, and so ignorant of it at the end? It is no easy task to reconcile this manifest contradiction.

11. The emperor goes on in the same strain, praising the Christians for their courage, and confidence in their God, during the earthquake, and upbraiding the heathens with their cowardice, and distrust of their gods. But the next sentence is the most wonderful of all. There the heathens are reproached for neglecting the other gods, and the worship of that immortal one, whom the Christians serve, etc. Is it possible that a pagan could have been the author of this sentence? reproaching the heathens for neglecting the worship of the Christian God, is reproaching them for not turning Christians. Would any heathen

^b Here they suffer upon a wise principle in the cause of their God: in that place he ridicules their obstinacy, in this, etc.

give the Christian God, the style of the immortal one, by way of distinction, from his own gods? Did they ever question the immortality of their own gods? Does not the first precept of the golden verses begin with *Ἀθανάτους μὲν πρῶτα Θεοὺς*, etc. The Christians were in the right to distinguish their God by this epithet, in opposition to the heathen gods, whom they all knew (whatever the Pagans believed) to have been mortal men, dead and buried many ages before. But no heathen, by the principles of his religion, would have made our God that compliment. If you think this sentence consistent with the character of Antoninus, with his reverence for his own religion, and contempt of ours, and with the whole tenor of his life and actions, I shall not envy you for your credulity. I am weary of consulting this wretched impostor, who has shewn himself such a stranger to all the rules of the *τὸ πρέπον*, and has neither the honesty to write truth, nor the art to contrive a probable lie. Having gone through the preamble, which is one continued satire on the heathens, and a panegyric on the Christians, in more high and extravagant terms than Constantine has used in his celebrated edict in their favour, I shall pass on to the enacting clause by which the Christian, if accused as such, is to be acquitted, and the informer punished.

12. It is a strong argument against the genuineness of this edict, if no instance can be brought during the whole course of Antoninus's reign, or after, that ever this law took effect, and that any Christian was discharged, or any informer punished by virtue of it. Shew me one example in all antiquity, and I promise to give up the whole controversy. I am not ignorant that Huetius, Valesius, and others, pretend that this law was executed against the accuser of Apollonius. But this is a strange mistake. For if the informer had suffered in pursuance of this edict, by the same rule Apollonius ought to have been acquitted; which Eusebius assures us he was not. On the contrary, we are certain from the apologists, that the Christians had never any benefit of this edict, that the persecution raged with the utmost severity in all parts of Antoninus's reign, as I shall shew hereafter, and that neither Polycarp nor the confessors of Lyons, nor any other martyrs of that reign, knew a syllable of any such law, or ever pleaded it in arrest of judgment. This single argument is of weight enough to shake the credit of the edict.

I have now finished the task I undertook, of unmasking this imposter, and, I think, have fully made good what Mr. Dodwell only hinted, that the edict could be composed by none but a Christian. I am so far from valuing myself on this achievement, that I have been often angry with you for assigning me the dull

drudgery of exposing so plain a forgery. A nice fraud would have required art and skill to detect it, and some credit might have been gained by the performance; but such a clumsy cheat can neither give pleasure in the inquiry, nor praise for the discovery.

II. *That the Persecution was carried on with his knowledge and consent.*

1. It would be loss of time to urge many arguments to prove so known a truth, as the persecution under M. Antoninus. For this I have the authority of all the apologists of that reign and age, backed by the joint testimony of all the church historians without exception. Nor do you pretend to deny the fact. The whole subject of our dispute is, whether Antoninus was the author of the persecution. Nor was it confined to a particular city or province, but universal in all parts of the empire, as we know from Celsus (ap. *Orig.*, p. 303-4), Justin (*Apol.* ii., p. 1), and Eusebius (lib. v., *Proœm*, chap. v.). Mr. Dodwell pretends, that it was purely owing to the fury of the rabble and the cruelty of the city magistrates, and that it did not extend to death, except in the case of the Lyons martyrs (*De Pauc. Martyr.*, chap. 38.) And all this he would infer from a mistaken passage in Athenagoras. But it is really astonishing that so great a man should be so blinded by his hypotheses, as to overlook so many plain and direct testimonies in the same author expressly against him. It did reach the lives of the Christians, as we know from Celsus (p. 403-4), from Justin (*Apol.* ii., p. 1, etc.), and Athenagoras (p. 9-10), with the acts of Polycarp and Melito (ap. Euseb. iv. 26), and many others, whom it would be endless to enumerate. It was carried on in the legal and regular forms of justice, by the judges and the law (*Athenag.*, p. 12, *Just.* and *Cels.*, ib.) And Athenagoras says, the provincial governors did not suffice to try the causes of the Christians that came before them (p. 132). At the same time I readily allow that the rabble had a large share in this and most other persecutions; and sometimes by their clamours gave a rise to them, and never failed to abuse, plunder, and insult the Christians, whenever the government declared against them. Nor was this persecution carried on in the common forms, but with unwonted rigour; strict search being made after the Christians, in order to their punishment. (*Cels.* *ibid.*, Euseb. v. 1.) Whereas under the moderate reign of Trajan, all enquiring after them was forbidden; and none could suffer by virtue of his edict to Pliny, unless they were formally accused like other criminals, and convicted of Christianity; which shews that the persecution was not carried on in pur-

suance of the old laws, but quickened by sharper edicts, as I shall shew hereafter.

2. So severe and universal a persecution could never be a secret to so watchful and vigilant a prince as Antoninus, whose whole thoughts and cares were devoted to the public. The Christians suffered martyrdom at Rome, under his very nose, which he could not be ignorant of (*Just. Ap. ii. 9*). Nor could the transactions in the remotest province escape his knowledge; for the governors all acted pursuant to the emperor's instructions, and were obliged from time to time to acquaint him with all the material occurrences in their provinces; of which we have a lively instance in Pliny's collection of letters to Trajan, where you see he consulted him, not only in the case of the Christians, but on the minutest affairs, which one would think were trifles below the emperor's notice. The same is apparent from the acts of the martyrs of Lyons, where the governor durst not proceed to punish the Christians that were citizens of Rome, till he had consulted the emperor, and obtained his orders for their execution. From this precedent we may guess at the behaviour of the governors in other provinces. That it was customary for the proconsuls to have recourse to the emperor's opinion upon those occasions, is manifest from Lactantius (*Instit.*, v. 11). He there tells us that Ulpian had made a collection of all the imperial rescripts against the Christians; and rescripts you know were nothing else but the emperor's decisions and resolutions upon all doubtful cases of law that were laid before them by the provincial governors. Ulpian wrote no lower than Caracalla, just after the fifth persecution under Severus; and it is plain that at that time the rescripts against the Christians had been very numerous, otherwise it had not been worth his while to have gathered them into a body. And from thence it is certain, that there had been more imperial orders against the Christians, and consequently more persecutions and martyrs than Mr. Dodwell will allow in the primitive church. This shews the absurdity of supposing that Antoninus could be ignorant of what was transacted in the provinces. And can you think him such a king of clouts, as to have suffered such proceedings against the Christians, if he had disliked them? or to have pardoned such contempt of his edicts, if he had ever issued any in their favour? Such a part might have suited well enough with the character of a Sardanapalus, who lived in the hands of his eunuchs and chamber-maids, or the Rois Faneans,^c that were slaves to the mayors of their palace. But it would be barbarous

^c The Carolingian race. V. Mez. ad Ann. 987.

to fix such a blemish on the most vigorous and active prince that ever reigned. But I have another argument still behind, to convince you that he could not be ignorant of the persecution. It is from the number of the Christian apologists in his reign—six of whom, viz., Justin, Athenagoras, Melito, Apollinaris, Miltiades, and Bardesanes, addressed and presented their apologies to him; the subject of which was to acquaint him with the persecution, and to desire him to put a stop to it. If he read these apologies, he could not help knowing the barbarous treatment of the Christians: if he threw them aside without perusing them, it is a sure sign of his scorn and aversion to Christianity, and a better argument to prove him a persecutor, than any that can be produced to the contrary.

3. To prove that he was consenting to the persecution, I need only allege the testimony of Justin Martyr (*Apol.*, i. p. 89, 133), who makes him concur with his father Antoninus (with whom he had some share in the administration of the government (*Melito*, ap. Euseb. iv. 26) in enacting capital punishments against the Christians. But to set this matter beyond dispute, I can produce the express testimony of Athenagoras, (p. 8,) that the persecution was carried on by his permission: [*συγχωρεῖτε δὲ μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντας—διώκεσθαι.*] To say the Christians were persecuted against his consent and edicts, as you suppose, is the greatest paradox in the world. Commodus, his successor, with one stroke of his pen, could entirely suppress the persecution in all parts of the empire, as we know from the Alexandrian Chronicle and Eusebius (v. 21). How came the edicts of such a hated prince to be so rigorously obeyed, and those of a prince so loved and adored, as Antoninus, to be treated with such scorn and contempt? This absurdity can never be accounted for. Shew me an example, in all antiquity, of a persecution under a prince indulgent to the Christians, except in the weak and despised reign of the emperor Philip, whose authority was grown so precarious, that there were that very year, no less than three rebellions against him, which ended in the loss of his life and empire. The arguments drawn from the clemency of Antoninus, to prove that he was not consenting to the persecution, are of no manner of weight. Trajan's clemency was as great and as justly magnified; and yet we are certain from the edicts of Ignatius, Pliny, and Eusebius (iii. 33), that he was a persecutor, though no very severe one. We have seen examples enough in our own age, that bigotry and blind zeal for a persuasion are apt to get the mastery of humanity and all other moral virtues. Nor could Antoninus, by the principles of his religion, think it an act of tyranny to maintain the established worship, by suffering

the penal laws against the Christians to be executed. It was for the service of his gods; and you very well remember that famous prediction of our Saviour, (John xvi. 2,) which was fully verified in the first ages of the church. Besides, in those days, "Qui consulta patrum, qui leges, juraque servat," was the popular description of a good prince as well as a good man. Nor could the heathens think it a blemish in his character to extirpate, by the most rigorous courses, a sect that were enemies to their gods, and stood charged by common fame with such heavy crimes, which Tertullian (*Apol.*, chap. ii.) has very luckily comprised in one sentence. "Christianum hominem omnium scelestum reum, deorum, imperatorum, legum, morum, naturæ, totius, inimicum existimas." And since this was the current character of the Christians in these times, one may easily account for his treating them with severities, that were otherwise so inconsistent with the gentleness and generosity of his nature.

[To be concluded in our next.]

Sepulchre of Samuel, in Ramah.—In ancient Ramah, now a village called in Arabic Neby Samuil, exists a mosque, which was formerly a church built by the Crusaders. The walls of this building are far from corresponding with the magnificence of its foundations, formed of enormous blocks of stone, which, though defaced, still shew traces of careful and elaborate rustication. On the southwest side of this building stands another of the same period. This contains, or rather covers, the rock in which is the prophet's sepulchre. By a door, formed of iron grating, opened for me by the dervish in charge, I entered a chamber cut in the rock. In the centre of this chamber is an enormous sarcophagus, which I recognized at a glance as a specimen of Moslem architecture, and which is the same that is exhibited with so much pretension and mystery through a hole traversing the entire thickness of the rock, to persons not permitted to set foot upon the rock overlying the tomb of the prophet, but who are obliged to be content with remaining in the upper room, where there is another sarcophagus of wood. This sight did not, however, suffice for me. Upon examining the court, I perceived an opening ten inches in diameter, running through the rock and communicating with a lower chamber, which was utterly dark. Besides that, I saw a passage railed off with iron bars; and inferred, from the rusty state of the gate, that the dervish himself never ventured to visit the old prophet, whom the Mussulmans declare to be still alive. All my endeavours to induce my guide to open this gate were fruitless. Though he persisted in seeking to compel me to retire, I accomplished my investigation as well as I could without him. By means of lighted paper thrown down the hole to which I have alluded, I discovered the existence, in the centre of the cavern, of a sarcophagus of whitish stone, of rectangular form at its base, surmounted by a triangular prism, without ornament or inscription. The walls of the sepulchral chamber were smooth, like those of the one in which I was. The smoothness retained the appearance of having been produced by a machine furnished with iron points, and which acted with a rotatory motion. I made the same observation from the horizontal grating, and perceived that the steps were cut in the rock itself. It is under the sarcophagus that the tomb cut vertically in the rock must be sought. In my examination I was favoured by fortune, or rather by the humidity of the place itself. Had it not been for this, the lighted paper which I employed would have ignited the petitions addressed to the prophet, and I should have been subjected to the wrath, not only of the custodian, but of the whole village.—*Pierotti.*

THE RESURRECTION: AN EASTER SERMON.*From the Spanish of Luis de Granada.*

“ And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment ; and they were affrighted. And he saith unto them, Be not affrighted : Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified : he is risen ; he is not here : behold the place where they laid him ; but go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee” (St. Mark xvi. 5—7).

I. ON this holy day, beloved brethren, in which the church celebrates with festive praise the joy of the Lord’s resurrection, no voice is heard more frequently than that which invites us to participate in the same joy. For many times is this verse repeated—“ This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it.” And, in truth, many will rejoice to-day, though not after the manner in which the holy apostle commands us to rejoice, when he says, “ Rejoice in the Lord always ; and again I say rejoice.” They do not rejoice thus, who are joyful only because to-day puts an end to their fasts, and their Lenten works of penitence ; and because now they may eat and drink, and amuse themselves, and live less strictly, because they are free from the shame and confusion of their Lenten confession. Those who thus rejoice, neither rejoice in the Lord, nor in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. This holy joy agrees not with those joys and desires, on account of which Christ, that he might banish them from the hearts of man, suffered and endured such anguish ; for where the joys and pleasures of this world flourish, this holy joy, which is so contrary to all mere gratifications of the flesh, is not understood.

But who are they who do participate in this great joy ? The first are those whose hope and glory arise with their divine Lord ; and it was in this way that the holy prophet rejoiced, when he said, “ My heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God.” Why is it that thou shouldest rejoice in the living God ? Because he having risen from the dead, and now living eternally, thy salvation, thy hope, and thy happiness have also arisen with him ; and they can never decay, because they are built upon him who is a firm foundation. Therefore the faithful have great reason to rejoice to-day. Sinners have also the same cause for joy ; if in the forty days of penitence they have washed away the stains of their sins ; and if, having forsaken the wickedness of the old man, and being animated with new life, they have arisen with Christ Jesus our Lord. By reason then of this great gift they can rejoice ; and to each one of them can be said, as the forgiving Father said to the prodigal son, “ Thou wert dead, and art alive again ; thou wert lost, and art found.” For has he not

indeed reason to rejoice, who is found after having lost himself; and who, after having escaped from death, is raised again to everlasting life by the ineffable mystery of redemption? These are they who love the salvation of their souls. These are they who esteem nothing so precious as this salvation, and who value it above all created things. These are they who, having been delivered from the death of sin and animated with new life through the grace of Jesus Christ, are gifted with spiritual feelings. These are they, lastly, who are filled with a heavenly joy worthy of this divine mystery. And that we also may enter into their joy to-day, my brethren, let us humbly implore the aid of the holy Spirit of our risen Lord.

In the holy gospel, beloved brethren, we have a great example of love and charity given us in the conduct of three holy women; who came bearing aromatic spices to anoint the sacred body of their Lord. They had seen him expire upon the shameful cross. Only a short time before they had left him entombed in the holy sepulchre. They were even distrustful of his resurrection. They knew that the stone was guarded by armed soldiers who would prevent them from touching it. And they believed that all they would gain from their sad office would be increased sorrow at the sight of that divine corpse. Not being influenced, however, by all this, and in order that they might render some service to the sacred body of their dear Lord, these holy women determined to pay him this last tribute of love. Behold then to what a length did love bear those who believed in Christ.

A holy saint tells us that true love does not wait to see what she actually can do; neither does she wait to satisfy herself that her efforts will be successful. She reckons as nothing, difficulties and hardships; and the only reward she hopes for is, that she may be able to comply with the wish of him whom she loves so fervently, and whom she endeavours to please, even at the cost of her life. We have a bright example given to us of this in the history of the three holy children whom Nebuchadnezzar commanded to be cast into the burning fiery furnace, as a punishment for the contempt with which they treated his statue of gold. For that wicked king said to them, "Is it true, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up? . . . If ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace, and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands?" And they made answer, saying, "We are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace; and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king.

But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." This is that perfection of love which waits for nothing, and which expects not to be paid the obligation which she is owed. She desires, she wishes for nothing for herself, unless it is pleasing to her beloved spouse. Those are very far off from attaining this love who can utter such words as these—Even to God I will not be obedient, unless I can hope for some rewards; for true love, a holy saint tells us, is not mercenary, and seeks no reward whatever.

And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre, at the rising of the sun. No one seems to have assisted the three holy women in their pious office; for in the evening of the day on which their dear Lord and master had been crucified, they brought spices and prepared them for his burial. The next day, the Sabbath, all was solemn silence according to the commandment. But the following morning they waited not for the rising of the sun, but with eager, hurried steps they went very early to the holy sepulchre, from whence the Sun of righteousness had already risen. We may well believe that they did not sleep the night before; for the feeling of recent sorrow, their anxious watching for the morning, was enough to keep them wakeful. Therefore, it is not to be wondered at that they beheld the holy angels, and were the first to know that the Lord of angels himself had risen from the dead, even he whom they had sought with such love and anxiety so early in the morning. Oh, how blessed are those who awake the dawn to seek their Lord, and who desire and long for him with devotion and love equal to that felt by these holy women.

On this subject a holy man well says, If thou didst daily watch at the gates of wisdom, and strive to learn her heavenly knowledge; if thou tarriedst in thy watch, as did the blessed Magdalene at the door of the holy sepulchre, thou wouldest indeed experience, as she did, the truth of that saying of our blessed Lord, the divine wisdom himself, "I love them that love me, and those that seek me early shall find me." St. Mary did indeed meet him, while it was yet dark, by whose sepulchre she had come to watch. And thou who dost not know the blessed Jesus according to the flesh, but only after the spirit, thou canst also find him if thou seekest him with similar desires. He will himself meet with thee, and counsel thee, if only thou art watching for him in prayer.

Say then to thy dear Lord, with the love and desire of the blessed Magdalene—"With my soul, have I desired thee in the

night; yea, with my spirit within me, will I seek thee early;" and with the voice of the holy Psalmist—"My voice shalt thou hear betimes, O Lord; early in the morning will I direct my prayer unto thee, and will look up;" and consider that, perhaps, thou too mayst be able to sing, and say as they did—"I will sing of thy power, and will praise thy mercy betimes in the morning; for thou hast redeemed me, O Lord, thou God of truth." On this account, it is not to be wondered at, that the saints are so careful to choose the early morning for their devotions, thereby consecrating to Almighty God the beginning of the day, and commencing their high and holy office of prayer and praise at the earliest hour. Hence that which is first in the order of time, is also the first in the order of dignity; and therefore did holy David incite himself to sing the divine praises at this hour, in these words—"Awake up my glory, awake lute and harp; I myself will awake right early." Or, as it may be rendered, I will awake the dawn; which means, not that I hope that she will arouse me from my sleep, but that I shall even awake the dawn who delayeth her coming. One of the friends of Job said to him, "If thou wouldest seek unto God betimes, and make thy supplication to the Almighty, . . . surely now he would awake for thee, and make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous." One of the holy hermits of old was wont to say, That in his morning prayer, he could foresee the whole of the day following. For if thou dost apply thyself to the office of prayer with diligence and devotion, all the labours of the day will prosper. From this may be understood, how ready divine grace is to assist those who watch for her; and therefore is it written in the book of Wisdom, "Whoso seeketh her early, shall have no great travail; for he shall find her sitting at his doors."

Oh, that my weak words were powerful enough to prevail on you, my brethren, to set apart a portion of the early morning for the study of divine wisdom, as well as for meditating on the mysteries of our holy faith, or upon the divine benefits; especially during the time that intervenes between now and Whitsuntide. For the Holy Spirit having then come down upon the holy apostles, you may be assured that he will also pour out upon you a portion of his manifold gifts. He will then fulfil you with the blessings of his sweetness; and after you have tasted of these, it will not be long ere you esteem all earthly pleasures as nothing worth, in comparison with spiritual joy. A holy father once said, that all the labour and trouble which there is in the practice of holiness shall endure until our souls shall rest entirely upon Almighty God, and then all that follows

will appear easy and pleasant to us. I may even add, that this trouble shall last whilst a man does not enjoy the full extent of divine sweetness; but after he has attained this knowledge, he will be able to exclaim with the great apostle—"I count all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord;" and after the example of the merchant in the parable, he will willingly sell all that he has, that he may be enabled to buy this most precious pearl. Neither ought it to appear strange, that this heavenly sweetness proceeds, not from the creature, but from the great Creator; for in every respect does it excel all other kinds of sweetness. Of this a saint tells us—That the soul, who lives in God, shall be straitened towards every other creature; for he who loves, who knows, who delights, and who lives in him, shall esteem all else as nought, compared to this great happiness. The fervour of the Spirit, says another holy man of old, quenches all evil desires; and the delights of spiritual joys entirely overcome the perilous pleasures of sin.

In returning to the history of the holy women, we must now take notice of their fear, which delayed them on their road, lest they should not be able to roll away the stone from the door of the sepulchre. "Who shall roll us away the stone," they said, "from the door of the sepulchre? . . . for it was very great." How opportunely do these words occur to us at this holy season; for there shall be many who, having thought seriously upon the means of repentance, and on that which always follows sincere sorrow for sin—a change in their manner of life—shall repeat these words in their heart, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? For the stone, which prevents the presence of Christ in our heart, is sin; and as the holy prophet tell us, "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God;" they are as a wall of adamant, which divide us from the Lord our Redeemer. The origin of all sin, said a saint of old, is an overweening self-love and self-will; and if these cease to exist, then shall the flames of hell cease also; for against what, but against our self-will, does the fire of hell rage? It is evident, too, that self-love is the path leading to all sin; from the fact that no one sins, unless he is induced to do so by the hope of attaining some gain or some satisfaction to himself.

Who, then, can roll away from his heart this heavy stone, so as to expel from thence every evil desire? Who is it that can overcome this powerful passion which gives birth to all others? Self-love is, in truth, so natural to every created thing, that not only do animals love themselves better than others, but the very

elements, as it were, mysteriously seem to have the same propensity. How then is this deeply-rooted passion to be overcome? It is of the greatest importance that it should be conquered; for our blessed Lord himself tells us—"He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life, in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal." Who, then, shall roll away from our hearts this heavy stone, which separates us from our most dear Lord? St. John seems to shew us the great difficulty attending this work, when he says, "They worshipped the beast (which is the devil), saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?" Of what avail is it to say to oneself—Who can overcome the love of self, which is so strong a passion, and the scourge of the earth? Who can overcome the laws of honour, of money, and of pleasure, which this love requires? Who can resist the customs of the world, and the habits of evil men? Finally, who is able successfully to struggle against, and subdue the impetuosity of his own will? In answer to all these questions, I will quote the following words:—"When they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away." And these words answer the question most plainly; for, that which seemed to be almost impossible for the holy women to accomplish, and to be far above their strength, they saw was miraculously done, without any trouble on their part. And the same thing happens every day, in the Church of Christ, to those true penitents who deem that the evil desires and longings of their soul are irresistible; and yet, when they turn to Almighty God, and fix their hearts firmly on him, and fervently, perseveringly implore his aid, they very often find that those very thoughts which they believed it impossible to overcome, have passed away with hardly an effort of their own. And hence, when they examine themselves as to their old failings, they find them not; and thus, seeing that the stormy passions, which troubled the repose of their soul, have disappeared, and have as it were flown away, they exclaim with wonder in the words of the holy Psalmist—"What aileth thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest, and thou Jordan, that thou wast driven back?" Truly, at the sacred presence of the Lord, the turbulent waves which agitated my soul have ceased; and at the presence of the Lord, my heart itself is changed. Like as a father, who, walking with his young child, carries him over the dangerous places that he may pass more easily over the hard and rugged parts of the road, than even over that which is smoother. So, in the most thorny places of life, in the arduous path of holiness, Almighty God our most pitiful Father, helps us with a special aid, and yet not without our helping ourselves; for though he who is "Father to Ephraim"

carries us in his everlasting arms, he still leaves us,—yet not without some help—to perform things less difficult to be done.

Thus it follows, that those who overcome great obstacles with facility cannot without some difficulty conquer small ones; and this, says an ancient father, is a most merciful dispensation of Almighty God; for by this token holy men see that they overcome, only by his most gracious aid, great difficulties, whilst of themselves they cannot overcome small ones without much trouble. And above all this, he foresees and prevents our dangers and impediments in the path of holiness, so that we may travel along it without stumbling. We are thus commanded by the prophet Isaiah: “Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather up the stones; lift up a standard for the people,” that all may walk safely through the unencumbered, easy paths of truth and righteousness. It is the care and office of divine grace to give unconquerable strength to faithful souls, and to remove from the road all obstacles over which a good man might fall. And this did Almighty God shew forth most clearly when he led the children of Israel back from the promised land; for when Pharaoh let them depart, we read: “That God led them, not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt; but God led the people about through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea.” The Almighty extends a similar providence over those whom he has delivered from the spiritual Egypt, which is the darkness of the world, to bear them on to their promised land, even to the heavenly Jerusalem.

From all this it is evident, how much we owe to the great author of our salvation, who not only rewards the faithful for their labours, but also gives them strength to bear them, and in his great mercy takes away all that would impede their advance in holiness of life. This did the holy patriarch Joseph do; for when his brethren were sent to buy corn in Egypt, he not only gave them corn for their support, but also commanded that money should be placed in the mouth of their sacks. And by this type our true Joseph, the Saviour of the world, is shewn forth to us, who gives us both the bread of angels and the money wherewith that most precious bread was bought. For he who gives us grace and glory, does he not also give us the corn and the money with which that glory and grace was obtained?

All this is what we are taught by the stone being rolled away from the door of the holy sepulchre by power from on high.

II. There is in this passage a particular mention made of St. Peter above all the other apostles, who were only named as his disciples; and this mention was made principally because St. Peter had sinned more deeply than the rest. For we learn that the disciples fled, but that St. Peter denied him; and therefore, because he had transgressed so grievously, it was expedient that he should receive more comfort, that he might be confirmed in the hope of pardon, and that all mistrust in his divine Master might be taken away from him.

Sin does indeed shake the very powers of the soul, and deal discouragement to the mind; and for this reason is it written that "The wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion." St. Peter was well aware of his unfaithfulness; he well knew that he who had esteemed himself more constant than the other apostles had sinned more deeply than they all. How then could he present himself before that Lord whom he had so lately denied? The publican hardly dared to raise his eyes to heaven; how then could St. Peter, who had sinned more deeply than he, have lifted up his eyes unto his divine Lord, had he not been encouraged by the more than ordinary favour? And this favour his blessed Saviour had graciously vouchsafed him, not to his tears only, but also unto that weakness which he strengthened by his honour. In this way our all-merciful Redeemer is wont to treat the weaker members of his Church, often times granting them things which they do not at all deserve; for if he were not to prevent beginners in the spiritual life with the blessings of his sweetness, they, being destitute of all spiritual enjoyment, would faint by the way; they would return to their accustomed and sinful pleasures. This grace ought indeed to incite the weak-hearted; so that in the fear of sorrow and difficulty they may be able to fly to him, who is always prepared to receive them with fatherly kindness, and who will always give unto them to drink of his most precious cup of blessing.

We must remember that St. Peter sinned not as Judas did, through malice, but through weakness. Theologians tell us that there are three sorts of sin, one against each of the three persons, of the ever-blessed Trinity. The first kind of sin is that of weakness against the everlasting Father, to whom all power is attributed. The second sin is that of ignorance against the eternal Son, to whom all wisdom is attributed. The third is that of malice against the Holy Spirit, to whom all love is attributed. The two first of these sins are forgiven with greater ease; but the forgiveness of the third is attended with greater difficulty. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that Judas,

who sinned through malice, should be condemned, and that St. Peter, who sinned through weakness, should be mercifully called to repentance. And besides all this, St. Peter arose again so quickly from his sin, that the sad words of denial had hardly escaped his lips, than bitter tears of penitence gushed from his eyes; and as soon as the cock crew, and his beloved Master turned upon him the eye of his mercy, the saint went forth, and wept bitterly. Faults like these, which are relieved by the healthful medicine of penitence, are soon cured; but when repentance is delayed, those small sins become great ones. Of these sins holy David laments, saying: "My wounds stink, and are corrupt, through my foolishness;" and they are healed with much difficulty. A long illness gives great trouble to the physician; whilst a slight ailment causes him but little trouble. Drops of ink, too, upon a garment, if they are washed away immediately, disappear from the spot; but if they are left to moulder, the stain cannot be removed.

A holy saint tells us, that if we fall a hundred times in a day, we can always rise again, trusting in the All-merciful One, who commanded St. Peter to forgive his erring brother, even until seventy times seven; and if this mercy may be obtained from man, how much more can be hoped from the greater goodness of Almighty God. Let us add too, that our Lord very often rewards true penitence in this manner; for sometimes he raises penitents by the earnestness and vehemence of their sorrow, to the highest order of perfection. And it was to that degree of sanctity to which St. Peter attained, who by the bitterness of his tears, obtained more grace than he had forfeited; and if it be true, as our blessed Lord assures us, that of the two debtors, whose debts were pardoned, he loved most to whom most was forgiven; is it then to be wondered at, that St. Peter loved his divine Master more than all the others did?

But it was more than this that the Lord gave to St. Peter, for though it was against him that he had sinned, our blessed Redeemer immediately turned, and cast the loving eye of his mercy upon St. Peter; and what is more wondrous still, he appeared to St. Peter after his resurrection, before he appeared to the other apostles. We read, too, that after the two disciples had returned from Emmaus, when they found the eleven assembled together, they said—"The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon;" and St. Peter, on the other hand, shewed the great fervour of his love to Christ, when he was casting his nets into the sea, with his brethren; he saw his beloved Lord standing on the shore, and he felt such an overpowering desire to be with him, that he cast himself into the sea, while the

others followed in a ship. The love which filled his heart was so great, that it seemed to him as if the oars would only delay his reaching his Lord, and that by casting himself into the sea, and swimming to land, he might arrive the more quickly. Truly Almighty God pardons our sins, in a very different manner to what men are wont to forgive others. The husband who forgives the wife who has wronged him, and restores her to her former position, hardly ever forgets her fault, and seldom places trust in her again completely; but our most pitiful Father, as king David tells us, does himself ease our shoulders from the burden of our sins, when we are truly penitent.

These things do we learn from the angel of the Lord, when he said to the holy women:—"Go your way; tell his disciples and Peter;" and immediately these words are added, "that he goeth before you into Galilee." What is meant by the unanimity of the evangelists on this point, which our blessed Lord himself also preached, that the mystery of his resurrection, which took place in Judea, should be seen in Galilee, first when he was seen by the holy women, then when he met his disciples, and at other times also, when he was seen in Judea? A deep mystical interpretation is certainly not needed here; for it had been prophesied often before its accomplishment, and although we do not find it in the letter of the text, we must search for it in the spirit. The Lord is known to have been crucified in one place, and to have risen again in another; and this signifies, that in one place the shame of the cross was to be preached, and in the other the mystery of the resurrection: for in Judea he was to be crucified, but by the Gentiles he was to be adored. This was clearly shewn forth by St. Paul to certain amongst the Jews, who rejected his preachings:—"It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." For the Jews, who had to know the cross of the Lord, were ashamed of it; and the Gentiles had to know the glory of the resurrection, by which they were called unto salvation. This is what seems to be signified by the word Galilee, which means transmigration, shewing that the belief in the resurrection was, as our blessed Lord tells us, to be changed, or to migrate from Judea into another country.

Moreover, this interpretation of the name signifies no doubt, that those who walk spiritually into Galilee, that is, those who have turned from wickedness to holiness of life, and from iniquity unto righteousness, are the most worthy to receive the belief in the resurrection: for none know better the truth and power of the mysteries of Jesus Christ than they who have

practically experienced their efficacy. The marvellous conversions of some of the most holy saints afford us a good example of this. They were transformed, in the most wonderful manner, to entirely different lives; and having cast away from them their old habits, they put on the new creature and were enabled to exclaim with the holy apostle—"If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new." They love the things which they hated before; they detest those which they formerly loved; they desire that from which before they fled; and they fly from that which they used formerly to desire most ardently. Spiritual and heavenly things, which they once loathed, are now become pleasing to them; they have overcome those appetites, which they used to serve; and they have now crucified that flesh, which formerly ruled them. Therefore, he who sees himself become so changed, that when he seeks for the old man, he finds him not, will he not then wonder how he has risen, and will he not easily believe that he who himself arose from the dead, will also be able to raise up the spiritual man unto newness of life?

That not less power is required for the resurrection of the soul than for that of the body St. Paul himself testifies, when he says, "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, that the eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling . . . according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead." For the same divine power which was able to bring back to life those that are dead, can as easily reanimate those souls who were dead in sin; and it follows, therefore, that those who walk into Galilee, those who are changed into another being, who are translated from the old to the new creature, it is these who embrace the mystery of the resurrection the more readily, being convinced of their own spiritual resurrection. On the other hand, those who have not turned aside into Galilee, who have not become changed from the old man into the new and heavenly creature, but who are still dead in trespasses and sin, these believe with more difficulty in the resurrection of their divine Lord.

The principal and greatest difference between the ills of the soul and those of the body consist in this, that the ills of the body are chiefly those which we feel at the time in which we suffer and which we feel, not when we have been delivered from them. Thus, "a woman when she is in travail hath sorrow because her hour is come; but as soon as she is delivered of the

child she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world." But the ills of the soul are those sins which we hardly know when we commit them, and which we sometimes even glory in doing; but when, through the grace of Almighty God, we are delivered from them, inspired by the Holy Spirit, then indeed we feel their great wickedness. For like a man who, on a dark night, travelling hard by a precipice, is unaware of his danger, because he sees it not; but when he passes by the same road in daylight, he is astonished and thankful at the sight of the great danger which he has escaped: so also he who is living in sin knows not his wretchedness nor his danger; but at last he becomes aware of it, when, having left the darkness of sin, he receives the light of grace, and perceives clearly the wickedness of his past life. He who persists in his sins is as one blind, seeing nothing; as one dead, feeling nothing; nay, what is more, he delights in his sin, and becomes as familiar with it as with him with whom he lives continually. And if he is urged, if he is exhorted, if he is called to behold the greatness of his sin, light is given him in vain as if he was blind, unless, indeed, he is assisted by the sovereign power of God which gives light to the blind, and life to the dead. And when at last he is awakened from his sins and is filled with grace, he then sees the wickedness of his past sin, he then knows the misery of the life he used to lead, and is horrified at his former darkness. He then feels the greatness of that divine benefit which has conferred such a favour upon him, and he rejoices, while at the same time he trembles; he rejoices in that his salvation has come unto him, and he trembles at the thought of the danger from which he has escaped.

It was with feelings such as these, that a holy saint, who had just been recalled to life, said—"I knew thee late, O thou true light, I knew thee late, for a thick cloud before mine eyes prevented me from seeing the light of truth. I have known thee late, O thou truth of old; for I was blind, and I went on from darkness to darkness, and yet thou, O thou divine enlightener, thou didst seek for him, who sought thee not; thou didst call him, who called not after thee; thou didst exclaim with a loud voice—Let there be light in this heart, and lo, there was light. The thick dark cloud which covered my eyes disappeared; and seeing thy light, I realised the darkness in which I had formerly lived. I was terrified, and exclaimed—Alas, alas, for the darkness in which I was plunged; alas, for the blindness, which prevented my seeing the light of heaven; alas, for my past ignorance, which kept me from knowing thee, O Lord, my enlightener."

In returning to the consideration of the text, there only remains for me to join the end of the sermon with the beginning. If you remember, I said that Jesus Christ having arisen from the dead, our hope, our salvation, and our happiness, have also risen with him who has returned to life; for as the holy apostle tells us, that Almighty God, "Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." "For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" wherever the head is, there will also the members be. How much the hope of this happiness incites the faithful to holiness, and how much comfort it gives them in the hour of trouble, no words can declare. Many examples might be given of this; but we will only meditate on the one which the history of holy Job affords us; for what but this most blessed hope was it that comforted this saintly man in the midst of all his bitter trials.

The mystery of the resurrection is thus illustrated and preached to us by him; for he was hardly able to magnify God with any other words. He says, "Oh that my words were now written; oh, that they were printed in a book, that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever." Already we see the greatness of the sentence that is to follow, for to whose mind has not been suggested a sentence which he desires to have written, in characters which cannot be effaced; so that it may be handed down to posterity? We may then well repeat, Oh, that my words were written, aye, written, but not after the common fashion of writing; for we read that he begs for a pen of iron, that this sentence may remain fixed on the hearts of man throughout eternity. What then is the secret of this saintly Job? What is this mystery which he was so anxious to hand down to posterity? Is it the manifestation of some hidden treasure? Is it the possession of some of those things which human covetousness so eagerly desires? Oh, it is in truth the shewing forth of an incomparable treasure; and what is it? It is a sentence not less difficult to believe than it is hopeful to be realized. "I know," he says, "that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another." O golden words; O wondrous faith before the law and the gospel; O saving hope; O new and never to be explained mystery. This hope is indeed rooted in my heart; but because some may be staggered by the wondrousness of the truth, and may doubt the meaning of the sentence, let us often

repeat to ourselves in other and equivalent words with him who uttered these marvels, "On the last day I shall surely rise again from the dead, I shall certainly put on my flesh for the second time;" and let us add, and "in my flesh shall I see my God and my Saviour; and not satisfied with this let us add again, "Whom I shall see for myself, and my eyes shall behold and not another."

What can be more clear; what more expressive can be said? Who, O holy man, before the revelation of the law taught thee such a philosophy, which not even the precepts of the law could teach the Sadducees? Where, O holy man, didst thou learn such wisdom; for in truth all philosophy disclaims this dogma of our faith, deeming it to be impossible for him who is dead to return to what he was before? No, does he answer us, no system of human philosophy taught it to me, neither did human sense, nor human reason, nor human doctrine teach it me. Divine faith alone taught me this truth; that faith which the most high God has instilled into my heart. With this hope did the patriarch Job comfort himself; and he comforted himself in such a manner, that though he was overwhelmed with calamity, and though every sort of evil befell him, he would not utter a single word against the providence of Almighty God. He, one of the greatest men of the East, rich in flocks and herds, was robbed of all his cattle; his servants were slain and consumed by fire; and, what was worse than all, his sons were all killed in one day, his person was covered with boils, and his very friends reviled him. What then, O holy man, what were the thoughts which comforted thee amidst these calamities, when the worms fed sweetly upon thy flesh, when thy bitter sorrow turned day into night? I ask thee, How was it that thou didst hold fast unto thy faith in God? How was it that thou didst love him who had allowed thine innocence to be doubted? We shall be answered, my brethren, with the same comfortable words: "I know that my Redeemer liveth." With this blessed hope, the downcast soul is comforted, and the bitterness of sorrow is assuaged. With the expectation of future happiness, I can endure present distress. This hope has been my consolation in trouble; and by it my soul has received strength. I search not for it without me, but I do look for it within my heart; for there my hope is firmly fixed. And where, let me ask, where is the wound that cannot be healed by this most precious remedy?

You see then, my brethren, from this one example, how much true faith in the doctrine of the resurrection alleviates every sorrow. "How much then are the ancient philosophers to be blamed, who placed the greatest good, and the highest

happiness of man in pleasure, without leaving them any hope of immortality. This indeed is the greatest comfort of man in this life, and the surest refuge from all sorrow; for, without this hope, these wretched men deprived life of the materials of all true and lasting happiness. This faith helps us not less in all acts of holiness, than it consoles us in all affliction; and therefore the holy apostle, after having carefully proved the mystery of the resurrection, incites the faithful to works of charity in these words:—"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord." And on the other hand, if men had not this hope, what would be the consequence but that which the apostle says in these words:—"If, after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus,"—that is, perhaps, against fierce and cruel men; "what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Finally, he says:—"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

Therefore a holy saint tells us—That in whatever work or business we are engaged, the power of doing that work consists in having hope for the future. He who sows, sows that he may reap. He who fights, fights that he may conquer. Besides this, supposing that all hope for the future was gone, what would be the result, but an entire abandonment of all acts of holiness and devotion? Oh, my brethren, let us, stimulated by this great hope, let us eagerly press forward to obtain the reward it promised us, of everlasting happiness; and let us not allow the opportunity of this present time to pass by in vain; for after this life it will never return again. We will not then be alarmed at the troubles which last so short a time; knowing that we shall be compensated for them with an eternal reward, and an everlasting crown, for I reckon that the sufferings of this present time, as the holy apostle says, are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.

May our Lord Jesus Christ, of his infinite mercy, grant us this, who liveth and reigneth with the Father and the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.

O. S.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We wish our readers to understand that we cannot be held responsible for the opinions of our contributors and correspondents. The utmost we can do is to keep a careful eye upon the literary character of their communications, and to see that they do not transcend the limits of fair criticism and lawful inquiry.]

SIR ISAAC NEWTON ON EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

(Continued from p. 468, Vol. I. New Series.)

The more the subject is examined, the more clearly shall we see how thoroughly erroneous is Mr. Bosanquet's notion of the identity of the Nehemiah of Ezra ii. 2 with Nehemiah the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah. In proceeding with the discussion it is scarcely possible to avoid partial and occasional repetition. The mention of two of the city-gates in the sixteenth verse of this eighth chapter, especially when taken in connexion with the "very great gladness" spoken of in the seventeenth verse, where these emphatic words wear the character of an explanation of the immediately preceding assertion that, "since the days of Jeshua, the son of Nun, unto that day, the children of Israel had not done so," *i.e.*, had not kept such a feast of tabernacles—all this, I say, assists in shewing beyond a doubt, that the disastrous state of things which had smitten Nehemiah to the heart, had wholly passed away. That heart-smiting scene of desolation, is thus described *as still existing in the twentieth of Artaxerxes* (B.C. 445), by Nehemiah himself in the seventeenth of the second chapter: "Then said I unto them, Ye see the distress that we are in, how Jerusalem lieth waste, and *the gates thereof are burned with fire*: come and *let us build up the wall of Jerusalem*, that we be no more a reproach." Who can reasonably doubt that previous to this season of "very great gladness," such as had not been exceeded at the feast of tabernacles "since the days of Jeshua, the son of Nun, unto that day," as described in Neh. viii. 16, 17, the desolate and ruined wall had been rebuilt, the city-gates restored, and the national reproach triumphantly removed.

If we turn to the third chapter we shall see how all that energetic rebuilding of the wall and gates which cause the "very great gladness" and exultation of the people, was accomplished through the patriotic zeal of Nehemiah. And what do we also find written in the fifteenth and sixteenth verses of the sixth chapter? "So the wall was finished in the twenty and fifth day of the month *Elul*, in fifty and two days. And it came to pass, that when all our enemies heard thereof, and all the heathen that were about us saw these things, *they were much cast down in their own eyes*; for they perceived that the work was wrought of our God."

Now the month *Elul* was the *sixth* month; and about five days after this memorable and victorious completion of the wall and gates, began the *seventh* month (*Tisri*), on the fifteenth and following days of which

the feast of tabernacles was to be kept. Well might a great festal celebration within three weeks after the vigorous and successful completion of the wall in defiance of the bitter enemies around them, and the triumphant removal of the national reproach, be one of very great gladness and exultation, comparable in this respect with any feast of tabernacles since the days of Jeshua the son of Nun.

The seventh chapter would seem to tell us what took place immediately after the completion of the wall in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, during the yet remaining days of the sixth month Elul. A charge is given, "That the gates of Jerusalem are not to be opened until the sun be hot," thus teaching us that the gates as well as the wall had all been duly finished. Before the close of Elul, when anxious to "reckon the people by genealogy," Nehemiah the Tirshatha discovers an old register which had been drawn up early after the return from Babylon, at the command of Zerubbabel, and he carefully read through the entire document, which he inserted parenthetically in the seventh chapter. After the long^a *parenthesis*, Nehemiah resumes his narrative in the eighth chapter which, advancing beyond the sixth month Elul in which the wall was completed, ushers in the immediately succeeding seventh month Tisri, on the first day of which, in the times before the captivity, was the yearly feast of trumpets, and on the tenth was the great annual day of Atonement. No express mention is made in this eighth chapter of these two feasts; but if we refer to Levit. xxiii. 23, 25, we shall probably see reason to believe that the words spoken to the people by Nehemiah, Ezra, and the Levites, viz., "*This day is holy unto*

^a Any person at all accustomed to these inquiries can scarcely help seeing at once that Neh. vii. 6, 73, is a long parenthesis, being the copy of an old register which is found in full in Ezra ii., and in the first verse of the third chapter, whence is borrowed the concluding clause of Neh. vii. 73, "and when the seventh month (B.C. 536-5) came the children of Israel were in their cities." The evidently parenthetical character of the latter part of Neh. vii. and the mention of the "name of Ezra the scribe" in the first verse of the eighth chapter, and the mention of "Nehemiah the Tirshatha, and Ezra the priest the scribe" in the ninth verse, will at once shew any candid reader, that the first day of the seventh month, mentioned in the second verse, was *later* than the seventh of Artaxerxes, and *not earlier* than his twentieth year (B.C. 445). This, it is hoped, will satisfactorily meet your correspondent's unsuccessful attempts to hide from himself and his readers his failure as a sifter and weigher of historical evidence. For Mr. Bosanquet thus comments upon this part of my letter, putting some of my words in italics;—"Again, if we are to '*see at once*,' as your correspondent writes, 'that the *seventh* month spoken of in Neh. vii. 73, has reference to what occurred in Judea in B.C. 536-5; but the *seventh* month spoken of in Neh. viii. 2, *evidently* refers to what took place in Jerusalem, some ninety years afterwards, in B.C. 445,' then is it also clear that the captives there spoken of as having come out of captivity had in fact never been in captivity, and that the following chapters of Nehemiah are thus abruptly disarranged (chap. vii., B.C. 536; viii., ix., x., B.C. 445, etc.)." As your correspondent is not very expert at "seeing at once that which appears nearly self-evident to most readers," I have taken pains throughout this letter to place things in as clear a light as I can, even at the risk of occasional repetition. His inaccurate statement, that I have represented the entire seventh chapter (of which the first five verses evidently belong to 445 B.C.) as belonging to B.C. 536, I regard as a sort of unwilling confession of his consciousness that he has not the best of the argument.

the Lord your God," Neh. viii. 9 refers to the feast of trumpets. If so, the feast of trumpets thus alluded to, on the first day of the Tisri of the twentieth of Artaxerxes, was kept by both Nehemiah and Ezra, who must be supposed to have united in taking part in the celebration of the feast of atonement^b on the tenth day of this same Tisri, and in the feast of tabernacles on the fifteenth and following days of the same month. It is certain from ver. 13 that Ezra the scribe was present at the latter feast.

Thus it becomes more and more clear that the joyous and exulting feast of tabernacles, recorded in the sixteenth and eighteenth verses of the eighth chapter, was celebrated not earlier than the twenty-first of Artaxerxes, in the presence of the Tirshatha Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, of the high priest Eliashib, the grandson of Jeshua, and of Ezra the priest the scribe. It was thus celebrated twelve years after Ezra had passed a season of mourning and fasting in the chamber of Johanan the son of Eliashib—this Johanan being a great-grandson of Jeshua the contemporary of Zerubbabel. Hence, while Mr. Bosanquet believes "*that the 'congregation of them that were come again out of the captivity'* (Neh. viii. 17), refers to '*the children of the province that went out of the captivity'* (Neh. vi. 6) *not their grandchildren,*" we think him to be thoroughly mistaken on this point, and believe that the congregation of those who kept the feast of tabernacles in Neh. viii. 16, 17, contained very few, if indeed any, of those children of the province who had returned to Jerusalem ninety years before, under Zerubbabel and Jeshua, and mainly consisted of the sons, and especially of the grandsons and great-grandsons of those returned children of the province.

We next come to the ninth chapter, and believe that the more solemn events described in it, took place in this same month Tisri, in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, which we conceive is intended to be taught by the commencing words of the chapter, "Now in the twenty and fourth day of *this month*," i.e., of the seventh month spoken of in the eighth chapter. Accordingly, we think that the sealing spoken of in the last (thirty-eighth) verse of this chapter, was executed in this same month and year, and that, beyond question, Nehemiah presided as Tirshatha at this national sealing. Hence it seems absolutely necessary to conclude that this must be identical with the *sealing* recorded at the commencement of the tenth chapter, in the first verse of which *Nehemiah the Tirshatha*, the son of Hachaliah, is expressly named at the head of those who sealed. At all events, even your correspondent will surely see at once that, as this Nehemiah did not become Tirshatha of Jerusalem until the twentieth of Artaxerxes (B.C. 445), he could not possibly have *presided as Tirshatha* over the national *sealing* at Jerusalem, recorded in Neh. x. 1, *earlier* than the twentieth of Artaxerxes, B.C. 445.

^b Though the day of the Atonement is not mentioned in this eighth chapter, it cannot be doubted that it was duly observed by Eliashib the high priest, Nehemiah the Tirshatha, Ezra the priest and scribe, and by the priests, Levites and people.

Sir Isaac Newton, as quoted by Mr. Bosanquet, allows that it was on the twenty-fourth day of the seventh month that the sealing recorded in the beginning of the tenth chapter took place; but, apparently, this great man seems to think that the sealing in question was accomplished long before the twentieth of Artaxerxes.

Your correspondent, also, quotes certain additional statements from the same great philosopher, which bear upon the present discussion.

1. Newton says, "*The history of the Jews under Zerubbabel is contained partly in the three first chapters of Ezra, and first five verses of the fourth.*" To these may be certainly added the whole of the fifth and sixth chapters. For the name of Zerubbabel is given in the second verse of the fifth; while it is said in Zech. iv. 9, "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house, his hands shall also finish it." Hence we conclude that Zerubbabel presided as Tirshatha at the completion and dedication of the second temple (B.C. 516-5), which are recorded at the conclusion of the sixth of Ezra.

2. Again, Sir Isaac Newton says—" *The history of the Jews under Zerubbabel is (also) contained partly in the Book of Nehemiah, from the fifth verse of the seventh chapter to the ninth verse of the twelfth; for Nehemiah copied all this*" (*i. e.*, from vii. 5 to xii. 9!) "out of the chronicles of the Jews written before his days, as may appear by reading the place," etc.

Now, to see how greatly Newton erred in this assertion, on his own chronological principles, may be easily shewn. Sir Isaac held that Zerubbabel and Jeshua returned with the liberated Jews into Judea, cir. 536 B.C. We may suppose the Tirshatha Zerubbabel not to have been less than thirty years of age at that time. He would thus be fifty in the sixth of Darius, B.C. 516; and one hundred and nine years old in the seventh of Artaxerxes, B.C. 457. At this advanced age we may be assured he was no longer Tirshatha, even if he survived to so late a period; and it is most reasonably probable that he died some time before the arrival of Ezra in Jerusalem, B.C. 457, with an important commission in the seventh of Artaxerxes.

It is plain, on the very face of the narrative, that Zerubbabel was not Tirshatha in B.C. 445, when Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah was in the twentieth of Artaxerxes made Tirshatha at Jerusalem. In that year Zerubbabel, if surviving, would have reached his hundred and twenty-first year. We do not, however, believe that he was then living.

Mr. Bosanquet may perhaps argue that all this rests on what he supposes to be the unwarranted assumptions that 538 B.C. is the correct date of the taking of Babylon by the Medes and Persians, and of the first year of the reign of Darius the Mede; and that B.C. 536 is the correct date of the first year of Cyrus' reign over Babylon, and of Zerubbabel's and Jeshua's departure from Babylon; and he may challenge us to prove from the obvious testimony of Ezra and Nehemiah, independently of such authorities as the canon of Ptolemy, that Sir Isaac Newton was in error on the point in question.

I do not profess to be able to give something like mathematical demonstration of this, but I think there is strong presumptive evidence

upon the face of the narratives of Ezra and Nehemiah that our illustrious philosopher was greatly mistaken.

It appears to me, and perhaps to Mr. Bosanquet also, that the assertion of Sir Isaac, "that the history of the Jews *under Zerubbabel* is (also) partly contained in the Book of Nehemiah from the fifth verse of the seventh chapter to the ninth verse of the twelfth," affirming that all that is related of the Jews within these limits, belongs not only to the life-time of Zerubbabel, but also to his administration, as Tirshatha of the government of Judea.^c

Now in Neh. viii. 9, express mention is made of Nehemiah the Tirshatha with Ezra "the priest the scribe." As your correspondent will not contend that there were two Tirshathas of Jerusalem at the same time, we unhesitatingly conclude that Zerubbabel had ceased to be Tirshatha when Nehemiah was appointed to that office. Again, we are certain from Nehemiah, iii. 1, that Eliashib, the grandson of Jeshua, was high priest when Nehemiah was made Tirshatha; and, accordingly (altogether waiving the reasonable scriptural probability that Eliashib was already in the *thirteenth* year of his high priesthood when Nehemiah arrived as Tirshatha at Jerusalem), we conclude confidently that Joiakim the father, and Jeshua the grandfather of Eliashib, were already dead in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, and that very probably Zerubbabel the contemporary of Jeshua had died before that year.

Further, we have good reason to believe that, about twelve years intervened between the arrivals of Ezra and Nehemiah at Jerusalem. Nehemiah expressly speaks of "*the former governors who had been before him*, and were chargeable to the people." These governors evidently interposed between Zerubbabel and Nehemiah. We cannot well rate their number at less than three or four. Their united administration would doubtless cover more than the twelve years' interval between the seventh and twentieth of Artaxerxes. Hence, we infer that Zerubbabel had ceased to be Tirshatha before the seventh of Artaxerxes. But in the seventh of Artaxerxes, Johanan the son of Eliashib, and *great grandson* of Jeshua, had a chamber in the buildings connected with the temple (Ezra x. 6). We think, therefore, that this Johanan, the great grandson of Jeshua, was not less than twenty years of age at that time—that it is certain that Jeshua was then already dead, and very probable also that Zerubbabel and Joiakim were no longer living. The reader, from what has been advanced in this discussion, will be now able, by comparing the statement of Newton with the language of Nehemiah, to judge for himself concerning the accuracy of Sir Isaac's affirmation.

NEHEMIAH.

"And all the people gathered themselves together as one man into the street that was before the water-gate; and they spake unto

SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

"The history of the Jews *under Zerubbabel*, is contained partly in the three first chapters of Ezra, and first five verses of the fourth; and partly in the Book of

^c I take for granted it will be conceded that Sir Isaac's words, "*The history of the Jews under Zerubbabel*," obviously signifies their history under the administration of the government by Zerubbabel as Tirshatha.

Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses. And *Ezra the priest* brought the law before the congregation both of men and women . . . upon the first day of the seventh month ; and he read therein before the street that was before the water-gate " (Neh. viii. 1—3).

"So they (the priests and Levites) read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading. And *Nehemiah*, which is *the Tirshatha*, and *Ezra the priest the scribe*, and the Levites that taught the people, said unto all the people, This day is holy unto the Lord your God " (Neh. viii. 9).^a

"And on the second day were gathered together the chief of all the fathers of the people, the priests, and the Levites, unto *Ezra the scribe*, even to understand the words of the law. And they found written in the law . . . that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in the seventh month . . . and that they should proclaim . . . in Jerusalem, saying, Go forth unto the mount, and fetch olive-branches, etc., to make booths as it is written. So the people went forth, and brought them, and made themselves booths, every one upon the roof of his house," etc. (Neh. viii. 13—16).

"And they kept the feast (of tabernacles) seven days ; and on the eighth day " (*i. e.*, on the TWENTY-SECOND of this same seventh month) "was a solemn assembly, according unto the manner. Now in the TWENTY AND FOURTH day of this month " (*i. e.*, surely of the same seventh month spoken of in the immediately preceding eighth chapter), "the children of Israel were assembled with fasting, and with sackcloths, and with earth upon them " (Neh. viii. 18, and ix. 1).

"And because of all this " (*viz.*, what is related in ix. 2, 27) "we make a sure covenant, and write it ; and our princes, Levites, and priests, seal unto it. Now those that sealed, were Nehemiah, the *Tirshatha*, the son of *Hachaliah*, and Zidkijah, Seraiah," etc. (Neh. ix. 38, and x. 1).

Nehemiah, from the fifth verse of the seventh chapter to the ninth verse of the twelfth ; for Nehemiah copied all this out of the chronicles of the Jews written before his days, as may appear by reading the place and considering that the priests and Levites who sealed the covenant on the twenty-fourth day of the seventh month (Neh. x.) were the very same with those who returned from captivity in the first year of Cyrus (Neh. xii.), and that all those who returned sealed it. This will be perceived by the following comparison of their names." Then follow two lists, assumed by Sir Isaac to be identical. Of these two lists, one entitled, *The Priests who sealed*, contains twenty-eight names ; the other, entitled, *The Priests who returned*, consists of only twenty-two names. To make these lists identical with each other, Newton is obliged to insert in the second list the name of Nehemiah, which is not found in the list of "the returned priests " (Neh. xii. 1—7) ; he is therefore obliged to borrow it from Ezra ii. 2. He is also obliged to insert six asterisks in the shorter list of twenty-two names, indicating that there are six names wanting in this list which appear in the other. Again, in order to make it clear that the names in the one list are "the very same" with those in the other, he identifies the following (certainly not without apparent reason).

Malluch	with	Malchijah.
Rehum	„	Harim.
Iddo	„	Obadiah or Obdia.
Sherebiah	„	Shebaniah.
Judah	„	Hodijah.

Newton then adds, "comparing therefore the books of Ezra and Nehemiah together, the history of the Jews is, that they returned from captivity under Zerubbabel, in the first of Cyrus, dwelt in their cities until the seventh month, and then coming to Jerusalem they first built the altar " (Ezra iii. 2), "and in the first day of the seventh month, began to offer the daily burnt-offerings, and read in the book of the law, and they kept a solemn feast, and sealed a covenant." Newton's only warrant for asserting that Zerubbabel and the returned Jews sealed a covenant in the first of Cyrus is, that Nehemiah and the Jews of his day, sealed a covenant in the twentieth of Artaxerxes. Is there sufficient ground for this assertion ?

^a Should it be objected that the mark of a paragraph is prefixed to ver. 9, which possibly may have a grave chronological import, like that which should

Now I venture to assume that, whatever was done by the Jews under the administration of Nehemiah the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah, was done *not earlier* than the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, and therefore *many years after* either the first of Cyrus (Ezra i. 1 and v. 16), or the sixth of Darius (Ezra vi. 15)—that the *whole of the eighth chapter* of Nehemiah relates what occurred at Jerusalem, under Nehemiah the Tirshatha, and Ezra “the priest and scribe”—that the supposed sealing in Ezra iv. 6, (if such a sealing really took place) occurred in the first or second of Cyrus, whereas the sealing in Neh. ix. 38 and x. 1, was executed *after* the appointment of Nehemiah to be Tirshatha, and therefore not earlier than the twentieth year of Artaxerxes; that Newton’s words, “*before Nehemiah’s days*,” must mean “before Nehemiah was appointed to be Tirshatha,” and that, when Sir Isaac says, “for Nehemiah copied *all this*, including the *eighth* chapter, out of the chronicles of the Jews written before his days,” his words, if they were intended to imply what they fairly express, must be understood as asserting *that everything that is recorded from* Neh. vii. 5, to Neh. xii. 9, happened *before* Nehemiah was made Tirshatha, and therefore *earlier* than the twentieth of Artaxerxes.

From this it would seem to follow as a strange but necessary inference, that the eighth of Nehemiah is not narrative, but *prediction* of an unusually minute character—that Neh. x. 1 is prophecy, not history—and that most probably the whole of the ninth of Nehemiah must thus be accepted as prediction rather than narrative. Should it be objected that we cannot possibly suppose such a man as Sir Isaac Newton to have fallen into such serious chronological errors, and to have so gravely misinterpreted plain historical records, we reply that chronology^c and history are neither mathematics nor natural philosophy

have been prefixed to Dan. v. 31, in order to indicate that some forty-five years passed between the death of Belshazzar and the taking of his Chaldean realm by Darius the Mede; it may be replied that a paragraph is also prefixed to ver. 13. Accordingly, if the former paragraph indicates an interval of some years between the eighth and ninth verses, in all fairness let the latter indicate a similar interval between the twelfth and thirteenth verses. So far as mere interval of time is concerned, it will be better for our present purpose to understand the former paragraph as indicating the ten minutes or quarter of an hour during which Nehemiah the Tirshatha, after the reading of the law had been finished, prepared to dismiss the assembly; and the latter as denoting the interval of *one single night* between the first and second day of the seventh month. Also, the paragraph prefixed to ver. 16, may indicate the longer interval of *ten or eleven days* between the second day of the seventh month, and the subsequent going forth of the people to procure branches to make the booths under which they were to begin to keep the feast of tabernacles on the fifteenth day of this same seventh month.

^c I cannot help thinking that, while Newton has occasionally erred when treating of scriptural chronology, he has not always been successful when commenting on the prophetic books, *e. g.*, in supporting the *Neronian* against the *Domitianic* date of the Apocalypse. I would not go so far as the writer of the celebrated article on prophetic interpretation in the *Times*, who says, “There are three schools of interpreters. A few—and these are very few and feeble—believe that the book of Revelation was all fulfilled in the days of Nero. This theory is discarded by every rational writer.” But I believe that Mr. Desprez, and your correspondent N.—who in his paper on the “Position and meaning of the Apo-

(in which Newton earned his illustrious name); and that it is by no means certain that eminence in the two latter is a sure qualification for the two former. Newton may have set himself down in good earnest to scriptural prophecy and chronology, under the strong bias of a previously formed theory. And have we not been recently taught how unsafe it is to do so, by Mr. Kennedy's mistake as to the year of Hezekiah's great passover, and by Mr. Bosanquet's very erroneous explanation of what Ctesias has related concerning the Median Astyages?

At the same time, holding Newton's name in all reasonable (and perhaps almost unreasonable) admiration and honour, I am as willing as any of your readers can be, to deal with his language as we are sometimes compelled to deal with that of Ezra and Nehemiah, viz., to assume that some of his words are not intended to imply what they express. Accordingly, I do not object to understand the assertion,—“For Nehemiah copied all this out of the chronicles of the Jews, written before his (Nehemiah's) days,”—as meaning to say that Nehemiah copied all this (at least *with the exception of the eighth chapter*, the first verse of the tenth, and perhaps the whole of the eleventh) out of the chronicles of the Jews, written before his days.

I have said that perhaps the whole of the ninth chapter belongs to the days of Nehemiah the Tirshatha, being very intimately connected with the eighth chapter. The latter chapter ends with what occurred on the eighth day, reckoning from the first day (the fifteenth of the month) of the feast of tabernacles, *i.e.*, on the *twenty-second* day of the seventh month Tisri. The next or ninth chapter begins with what occurred on the *twenty-fourth* day of *this* same month, *i.e.*, the seventh month. This ninth chapter and this twenty-fourth day begin with fasting and sackcloth, and end with a *national sealing* on the part of princes, Levites and priests. Nor does it seem possible to separate the national sealing of ix. 38, from that national sealing in x. 1, over which Nehemiah the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah, evidently presided. Thus it seems absolutely necessary to regard *the whole of the ninth chapter* to record events, which took place at Jerusalem after the arrival there of Nehemiah as Tirshatha.

By a “national sealing” I would here understand a formal and public sealing by the princes, Levites and priests,” in the name and behalf of themselves and the whole nation. I am inclined to consider such a public sealing as marking great and wide spread earnestness of feeling and purpose in the people, and to have been of rare occurrence. Indeed, on turning to Cruden's *Concordance*, I find that the only references there given to such a national sealing, are Neh. ix. 38, and Neh. x. 1. No allusion is made to anything of the kind in the book of Ezra; and such a decided transaction well accords with the fervent earnestness and vehement (though deeply rooted and lasting) zeal of such a Tirshatha as Nehemiah.

calypse” (*J. S. L.*, Jan., 1862, p. 387), considering his view to be absolutely certain—if well informed, rational and clever, are yet unsuccessful upholders of the Neronian date of the Apocalyptic vision in Patmos, against the Domitianic.

It would perhaps be not a valid objection to this view to ask, how can the "fasting and sackcloth of the twenty-fourth of Tisri" be reconciled with the "very great gladness" which had just before prevailed throughout the nation, during the feast of tabernacles, from the fifteenth to the twenty-second of this same month?

We reply that the whole of that Tisri, and the latter portion of the preceding month, Elul, appear to have been a season in which the power of God was felt in the hearts and consciences of the Jews and the surrounding Gentiles. Thus we read, vi. 16, that at the completion of the wall, "the heathen around Jerusalem were much cast down in their own eyes; for they perceived that this work was wrought of our God." And it is evident from the eighth chapter that throughout this month Tisri, a remarkable spirit of religious reverence and attention to the divine law pervaded the people. On the tenth day of this same Tisri they had doubtless kept the annual day of atonement, one of the most solemn days in the whole year. And there does not appear to be anything strange or inconsistent in the fact that after all the great religious services of the month had been completed, the minds of the people should humbly, and penitently, and gratefully think upon the past and present, and desire to pledge themselves to walk more obediently before God for the future. We can therefore without difficulty believe that the fasting, humiliation, and public confession, together with the rare and seemingly unique act of a national sealing occurred in the Tisri of the twentieth of Artaxerxes, under the earnest teaching of Nehemiah; while we greatly doubt if Newton had sufficient grounds to justify him in asserting that there was a national sealing at Jerusalem, in the first of Cyrus, in the first Tisri, that occurred after the return from Babylon.

A somewhat similar form of reasoning might be applied to the manifestation of religious and patriotic earnestness and zeal, displayed by the people in Neh. ix. 28, 39. It is under such a Tirshatha as the fervent, and patriotic and indefatigable Nehemiah, and at such a time of strong and wide spread religious and conscientious reverence and zeal, as is described in the eighth and ninth chapters, that we can most readily believe the following act of solemn self-dedication to have taken place on the part of a certain portion of the people:—"They clave to their brethren, their nobles, and entered into a curse, and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, etc." Also, the use of the first person plural 'we' throughout Neh. x. 28—39, appears to favour the idea that these events belonged to Nehemiah's government. And whatever may be said of the supposed very great resemblance of names in the earlier part of the tenth and twelfth chapters, it is as certain that the first verse of Neh. x. is *not earlier* than the twentieth of Artaxerxes, as it is that the events recorded in the first verse of Neh. xii. are not earlier than the first of Cyrus.

Again, that which Darius writes in Ezra vi. 9, 10 does not, in point of care and interest about the minute details, equal these words given by king Artaxerxes in his commission to Ezra: "Also we certify you, that touching any of the priests, and Levites, singers, porters, Nethinims, or ministers of the house of God, it shall not be lawful to impose toll,

tribute, or custom upon them" (Ezra vii. 24). Accordingly, we are inclined to believe, when reading Neh. xi. 22, 23, "Of the sons of Asaph, the singers were over the business of the house of God. For it was the *king's commandment* concerning them, that a certain portion should be for the singers, due for every day"—that the *king*, here mentioned, was not Darius Hystaspes, but Artaxerxes, and that these two verses, and therefore most probably the whole eleventh chapter, were not earlier than the seventh of Artaxerxes, and may probably have been as late as his twentieth year; on both suppositions, certainly *after* the close of the administration of Zerubbabel, and most probably, not to say certainly, *after his death*.

Again, it is evident that Neh. viii. 4, describes a state of things still existing even after the completion of the city wall and gates, in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, B.C. 445:—"Now the city was large and great, *but the people were few therein*, and the houses were not builded." I presume it is self evident that these words—"and the houses were not builded," are not to be understood as rigorously implying what they might seem at first sight to express. We are not to suppose that no houses had been then completely built; some, at least, of the "cieled houses" spoken of in Haggai i. 4, may very probably have been erected at Jerusalem; but rather, that only a small number of houses compared with what was required to fill properly the space enclosed within the wall of the city had been built.

And how strikingly do the words in Neh. vii. 4, "*but the people were few in Jerusalem*," agree with what is said in the first and second verses of the eleventh chapter, "And the rulers of the people dwelt at Jerusalem; the rest of the people also cast lots, to bring one of ten to dwell in Jerusalem the holy city. And the people blessed all the men *that willingly offered themselves to dwell at Jerusalem*."

What could be more natural than that Nehemiah, after the city walls and gates had been completed, should feel hurt at the want of inhabitants and houses in the city of David? Accordingly, he would exert himself and take measures to remove this reproach. And we may accept the first and second verses of the eleventh chapter as a record of the result of Nehemiah's efforts. The triumphant restoration of the city wall and gates, the fervent religious patriotism of Nehemiah, and his popularity with his Jewish brethren, assist us in understanding how it was that "men willingly offered themselves to dwell at Jerusalem," at that time.

Thus, in direct opposition to Newton's view, viz., "that the history of the Jews under Zerubbabel, is (partly) contained in the book of Nehemiah, *from the fifth verse of the seventh chapter to the ninth verse of the twelfth*; for Nehemiah copied all this out of the chronicles of the Jews, written before his days, as may appear by reading the place"—it would seem reasonably probable, to say the least, that all the events that are recorded from Neh. viii. 1, to Neh. ix. 21 (and indeed the remaining portion of the eleventh chapter), do *not*, as Newton supposed, form a portion of the history of the Jews under their Tirshatha Zerubbabel, but that they happened some years after his death,

and after the appointment of Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, to be Tirshatha at Jerusalem.

Sir Isaac Newton also writes; “Yea, Nehemiah, the same Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, was thus Tirshatha, and subscribed the covenant (which had already been subscribed by Meshezabeel and Haniah in the reign of Cyrus, Neh. x. 3, 21, 23), Neh. x. 1, and viii. 9; Ezra ii. 2, 63.

Mr. Bosanquet brings forward this quotation to shew how mistaken I was in my “unhappy conjecture that Newton ‘would almost certainly have rejected the notion that the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah and cup-bearer of Longimanus, is to be identified with the Nehemiah who came up with Zerubbabel.’” If there be no error of the press in placing a semicolon between Neh. viii. 9 and Ezra ii. 2, 63, in the above quotation, it does not seem as if Sir Isaac were very desirous of bringing Nehemiah the Tirshatha into too close proximity with Nehemiah the companion of Zerubbabel and Jeshua. At all events, when Nehemiah the Tirshatha subscribed the covenant in the high priesthood of Eliashib, the grandson of Jeshua, in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, and when Johanan the great-grandson of Jeshua was probably not less than thirty years of age, we may be allowed to say, with all due deference to Newton, that most probably, if not certainly, Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and *their companion Nehemiah*, had ceased to be numbered among living men.

It is to my mind an insuperable objection to Mr. Bosanquet’s theory, and to Newton’s also, if he too held the same erroneous view, that he identifies the Nehemiah (Ezra ii. 2) who came from Babylon with Zerubbabel and Jeshua, with the Nehemiah who was cup-bearer at “Shushan the palace” in the twentieth of Artaxerxes. Sir Isaac Newton and your correspondent both hold the Nehemiah of Ezra ii. 1 to have been a priest, a descendant of Aaron; and it is most likely that this view^f is correct. This descendant of Aaron must therefore be supposed, as a person consecrated to the priestly service of the Most High, to have taken part with his brethren in their solemn religious services, when the altar was set up (Ezra iii. 3). It is reasonable and probable to suppose that this Nehemiah was not less than forty years of age in the first year of the reign of Cyrus over Babylon. How then can we explain the fact (if so wild and incredible a notion can for a moment be regarded as a fact) that, with the vows of Israel’s priesthood upon him, after having officiated as a priest at the altar erected amidst the ruins of Jerusalem, he should have left^g the holy city, and, turning his back upon his brethren and friends, should have recrossed the Euphrates, proceeded beyond the Tigris, taken up his abode at Shushan, and ultimately been promoted to be cup-bearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus—if even such a confidential office could be regarded as a pro-

^f But how does Newton prove that Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, the Tirshatha, was a priest, a descendant of Aaron? If Mr. Bosanquet cannot shew this to have been the case, he should speak less positively on the supposed identity of the two Nehemiahs.

^g See *J. S. L.*, January, 1862, p. 445, “Nehemiah the Tirshatha.”

motion to a priestly descendant of Aaron, who in time past had officiated in that character at the altar of the Most High in Jerusalem. If this be true, how little of the genuine feelings of the God-fearing and patriotic Jew must this cup-bearer have possessed during the earlier years at least of his residence beyond the Tigris, after his desertion of the holy city; though it would seem that subsequently, when very, very far advanced in years, patriotic regard for Jerusalem and his countrymen glowed anew in his heart, and he once more made the holy city his home.

But there is something more to be mentioned almost as wild and incredible as this. According to Newton's chronological views, the Nehemiah who forsook Zerubbabel and Jeshua, was actually filling the office of cup-bearer at Shushan, in a manner perfectly satisfactory to his royal master, in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, B.C. 445, when this Jewish priest had reached the *one hundred and thirty-first* year of his age. If we could ascertain that before his arrival at Jerusalem with Zerubbabel and Jeshua, he had been cup-bearer to Belshazzar, or to Darius the Mede, or to both, there might perhaps be a sandy (and a very sandy) foundation for such a chimerical superstructure. Is it surprising if I found it impossible to believe that the sagacious Newton could ever have been led captive by such a wretched hallucination? or if I still hope that your correspondent must be mistaken in thinking that our great philosopher should have fallen into so unaccountable an error?

It will not much avail Mr. Bosanquet to endeavour to shake off Sir Isaac here, and to say, "I hold that Jerusalem was taken and destroyed in B.C. 560 (*twenty-eight* years later than the commonly received date), on the authority of the Jewish writer Demetrius. Accordingly, on my theory, it is not necessary for Nehemiah to have been forty years old, until some twenty-eight years later than B.C. 536, *i.e.*, until B.C. 508." But is there any very great cause for triumph here? If Nehemiah were forty years old in B.C. 508, he would be in his one hundred and third year when, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 445, while yet the cup-bearer at Shushan, he was appointed to be Tirshatha of Jerusalem, and re-crossing the Tigris and Euphrates, zealously, and with all the activity and energy of early and vigorous manhood he executed his responsible office during twelve years. At the close of this period, when already in his one hundred and fifteenth year, he re-crossed the Euphrates, and returned to the court of Artaxerxes. A few years^a afterwards when in all probability he was

^a I give the following extract from Jahn's *Hebrew Commonwealth*, without professing entire agreement with it. "Prideaux dates the second administration of Nehemiah from the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, B.C. 408. Though I do not attach equal importance to all the reasons which Prideaux has adduced in support of his opinions, yet some of them are conclusive, and I shall add others which he has not noticed. . . . When Nehemiah came to Jerusalem the first time, he was royal cup-bearer, an office most usually filled by handsome young men. He was then probably *between twenty and thirty* years old, and consequently after a residence of twelve years at Jerusalem, and of twenty-four more in Persia, he would have reached the age of fifty-six or sixty-six, at which time of life he

not less than one hundred and twenty-six years old, he returned to Jerusalem, and resumed with vigour and zeal the duties of government there.

Dean Prideaux, who is followed by Jahn, thinks that Nehemiah, who returned to Shushan in the thirty-second of Artaxerxes, did not go again to Jerusalem until the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, B.C. 408, having thus been absent from that city twenty-four years. At all events, if the reader will look at Jahn's reasons for his opinion, in the foot-note, and bear in mind that Josephus testifies that *Nehemiah lived to a very great age*, I think he will agree with me that Nehemiah was absent at least twelve years, and did not return to his government in Judæa earlier than B.C. 420, and was still the Tirshatha as late as B.C. 410.

Bearing this in mind, let us look at the year upon which Mr. Bosanquet lays so much stress, viz., B.C. 493, the year in which he supposes Darius the Mede to have taken the Chaldean kingdom after the death of Belshazzar. If we suppose the Nehemiah of Zerubbabel and Jeshua to have been only forty years old at that time (B.C. 493), he would be in his hundred and thirteenth year when Tirshatha in B.C. 420, and in his hundred and twenty-third year in 410 B.C.

And in addition to insuperable chronological difficulties, the hypothesis of Mr. Bosanquet is burdened with the ludicrous and crushing necessity of assuming that the Nehemiah of Zerubbabel, the descendant of Aaron, abandoned his sacred priestly duties at Jerusalem, and went

might easily be supposed to leave the service of the court, and become governor of his own people. If, *as Josephus says*, Nehemiah lived to a very great age, he would now have many years to spend at Jerusalem.

"But that the second arrival of Nehemiah at Jerusalem, and his last reformation, could not have taken place *in one year* after his return to Artaxerxes, as is generally^a supposed, is evident from the narrative itself. For in the short space of one year, how could so many great abuses have crept in as Nehemiah found it necessary to correct; the gross profanation of the temple, the open violation of the Sabbath, the unjust withholding of the tithes, in consequence of which the priests were forced to neglect their official duties, and to accept defective offerings in order to obtain subsistence? Should the phrase (אֶחָדָם יוֹם) "at the end of days," which Nehemiah employs to express the time of his return, be appealed to; I trust it will be granted that אֶחָדָם does not always mean exactly one year; but is frequently used for an indefinite period comprehending several years. *That the latter is the meaning of the phrase is manifest*; for though we may suppose it possible for marriages to be contracted with foreign women, and for them to become mothers in the space of one year, yet their children could hardly learn so soon to speak a jargon made up of the Jewish and heathen tongues, much less have beards for Nehemiah to pull (אֶחָדָם), Neh. xiii. 23, 25. On the contrary, all this is easily explicable, on the supposition that Nehemiah remained in Persia twenty-four years. It is surprising that these circumstances should have escaped the notice of all the commentators."

^a The translators of our authorized version, and the compilers of its marginal chronology, seem to have thought that when Nehemiah returned to Shushan in the thirty-second of Artaxerxes, he was not absent from Jerusalem *more than one year*. The former have rendered the Hebrew by "*after certain days*," though they have placed in the margin the literal version, "*at the end of days*."

to live among the far distant heathen on the east of the Tigris, finally becoming the cup-bearer of a heathen king. How little, we repeat, of the deep and genuine religious and patriotic feelings of a God-fearing Hebrew must this Nehemiah be supposed to have had, when he could bring himself to pursue such a course.

I have already said that it does not appear improbable from Ezra x. 6, that Eliashib was already high priest, as the successor of his father Joiakim, when Ezra arrived at Jerusalem in the seventh of Artaxerxes. It is difficult to obtain any additional light on this point.

I do not offer the following attempt to get an averageⁱ duration of the Jewish high priesthood, as a very satisfactory one. From Neh. xii. 10 and 28, we learn that the following six high priests succeeded each other (son following father), viz., Jozadak, Jeshua, Joiakim, Eliashib, Joiada, and Jonathan. They all appear to have died a natural death, and to have retained their office until the time of their decease. Jozadak began to be high priest in the year of the destruction of Jerusalem B.C. 588; Jeshua was high priest in B.C. 536, the first of Cyrus, and in the second of Darius, B.C. 520. Of Joiakim we have no special information; only it is said of certain porters and others, (Neh. xii. 25),—"these were in the days of Joiakim, and in the days of Nehemiah the governor, and of Ezra the priest the scribe." We know that when Nehemiah was made governor, Eliashib, the son of Joiakim, was already high priest; and, as we have seen, we are not destitute of reasons for supposing that Joiakim had ceased to be high priest before Ezra received his commission in the seventh of Artaxerxes. Eliashib is also mentioned in Neh. xiii. 4, but we are not told when he died. We are accordingly compelled to have recourse to secular sources of information. The Alexandrian chronicle informs us that Eliashib died, and was succeeded by his son Joiada, in the eleventh year of Darius Nothus, B.C. 412. Joiada died, and was succeeded by Jonathan in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Mnemon, B.C. 372; and Jonathan died in the eighteenth year of Darius Ochus, B.C. 340.

Hence, from B.C. 588 to B.C. 342,—a period of two hundred and forty-six years—there were six high priests; accordingly their average

ⁱ On one occasion Mr. Bosanquet does not appear to have been treated quite fairly by Mr. Savile. The former (following the late duke of Manchester) says; "St. Matthew tells us, that from the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations, i.e., $14 \times 40 = 560$ " (*J. S. L.*, January, 1852, p. 462). Mr. B. thus gives forty years to a generation. Mr. Savile says in reply, "This is too indefinite to rest an argument upon, for St. Matthew equally says, 'The generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations,' which, instead of being confined to five hundred and sixty years, includes a period of about nine hundred years" (*J. S. L.*, April, 1857, p. 169). Upon reflection Mr. Savile will see that it is unreasonable to seek a fair average from the combined ages of fourteen men, the first three of whom died—Abraham at the age of one hundred and seventy-five years, Isaac of one hundred and eighty, and Jacob of one hundred and forty-seven. There were, in reality, seventeen generations between David and the destruction of Jerusalem, a period of about four hundred and twenty-seven years. This would give an average of twenty-five years to a generation. This is too short, and kings are certainly not the class from which we should seek to obtain the average duration of human life.

duration of office would be forty-one years,^j apparently a long one, yet Joiada's lasted forty. On this view, the combined priesthoods of Jozadak, Jeshua, and Joiakim, would amount to one hundred and twenty-three years; and thus Eliashib would become high priest in B.C. 465, eight years before the arrival at Jerusalem of Ezra, in the seventh of Artaxerxes. If we take B.C. 578, which Mr. Savile seems to think was Josephus' date for the destruction of Jerusalem, the average will be thirty-nine years and a third. Accordingly, the duration of the combined three priesthoods will be now one hundred and eighteen years; and thus Eliashib would succeed Joiakim in B.C. 460, three years *before* Ezra's arrival, B.C. 457. Both these averages are favourable to the view that Eliashib had already succeeded his father, Joiakim, in the high priesthood before Ezra received his commission in the seventh of Artaxerxes; a view which I am inclined to take, independently of them, from the language of Ezra x. 6.

I trust that enough has been advanced to shew how thoroughly untenable is the notion that the Nehemiah who was the companion of Zerubbabel and Jeshua in the first year of the reign of Cyrus over Babylon, is to be identified with Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, who was cup-bearer at "Shushan the palace" in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, B.C. 445. Your correspondent tells us that he has "always felt the greatest reverence for these observations of Newton," which tend to advocate the chimerical identification of which we have been speaking; I can only say that his organ of veneration must be far more prominent than mine. If the sagacious Newton really held this baseless notion, we may cease to be surprised that such an able and logical writer as bishop Horsley should have regarded a portion at least of the discussions of Newton, on points of scriptural chronology and prophecy, as merely the production of an ordinary man.

Mr. Bosanquet makes this remark upon a part of my letter on Nehemiah the Tirshatha: "Your correspondent thus asks us to take for granted the 'almost universally allowed' arrangement of the reign of Cyrus. In other words he simply begs the question at issue. His argument is good, if we admit the correctness of his chronology, which is called in question, but needs no further consideration, until he can establish that the first year of Cyrus was B.C. 536.^k

^j If we take the very improbable date of Demetrius, viz., 560 B.C., the average will be thirty-six years and a third; the combined priesthoods of Jozadak, Jeshua, and Joiakim, will be one hundred and nine years, and Eliashib would thus succeed Joiakim in B.C. 451, six years *after* Ezra's arrival at Jerusalem in B.C. 467, and six years *before* the arrival of Nehemiah as Tirshatha in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, B.C. 445.

^k Mr. Bosanquet writes, "I perfectly agree in the proof that Cyrus (the father of Cambyses) died about B.C. 530, and before the accession of Cambyses to the throne and empire of Persia." He then proceeds to neutralize this concession on the following very unsatisfactory and unfounded assumption, "I have repeatedly asserted my conviction for many years past, that Cyrus or Khosru was distinct from Cyrus or Coresh the grandson of Astyages, and that *both Herodotus and Xenophon have confounded the histories of these two kings together*! I cannot therefore concur in the truth of the assertion, that Cyrus or Coresh died about B.C. 530." Mr. Bosanquet "holds that Cyrus or Coresh (the Cyrus or

Mr. Bosanquet is scarcely entitled to dismiss the matter in such an off-hand way. Writers fully as competent as he, to pass judgment on such a question, have embraced the opinion to which he is opposed. Without laying too much stress on Ptolemy's Canon, which appears even to make B.C. 538 the first of Cyrus; I may perhaps safely say that B.C. 536 is accepted as the very probable date of the first year of the reign of Cyrus over Babylon, by Dr. E. Hincks, Sir H. Rawlinson, Jahn, Carl Auberlen, Mr. Elliot, Mr. H. Savile, and the author of the paper in this Journal on "Theories of Biblical Chronology." I should suppose that such an array of names would make Mr. Bosanquet think a little "further consideration" needful before he finally determines to reject what they have accepted.

The mention of Cyrus leads me once more to the Jewish writer Demetrius. Mr. Bosanquet agrees with Herodotus in thinking that Cyrus defeated Astyages, cir., B.C. 560. The Greek historian adds that a few years after, Nitocris, queen of Babylon, became alarmed and apprehensive at the growing greatness of Cyrus, and that she was at extraordinary pains to fortify the approaches to Babylon against this formidable and ambitious neighbour.

Mr. Bosanquet holds also with Demetrius, that Nebuchadnezzar took and destroyed Jerusalem cir. 560 B.C., in the year in which Cyrus defeated Astyages. Now if Nebuchadnezzar, who reigned forty-three years, took Jerusalem in the nineteenth year of his reign, in B.C. 560, is it not strange then that he should appear never to have been jealous or apprehensive of the rising power of the ambitious Persian? According to the twofold hypothesis of Mr. Bosanquet concerning B.C. 560, viz., that in this year Nebuchadnezzar took and destroyed Jerusalem, and Cyrus conquered Astyages; from that year onward Cyrus and Nebuchadnezzar were contemporary sovereigns during twenty-three years, the latter dying (on Mr. B.'s hypothesis) cir. B.C. 537, about a year (according to Ptolemy's Canon) after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. Thus too we must suppose that the warlike and ambitious Chaldean quietly looked on while Cræsus, the ally of Babylon, was crushed by Cyrus, and afterwards tamely allowed the Persian to wrest from him Elam, with its fortress palace of Shushan. Is then Mr. Bosanquet quite consistent in holding what it seems impossible to uphold, viz., that in one and the same year Cyrus conquered Astyages, and Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Jerusalem. As well, almost, might we attempt to uphold the hypothesis that Zerubbabel the Tirshatha celebrated the feast of tabernacles at Jerusalem in the first of Cyrus, before the foundation of the temple was laid, in the self same month and year in which Nehemiah the Tirshatha kept the feast of tabernacles in Jerusa-

Coresh of Isaiah, Daniel, and Ezra) was living and reigning in B.C. 511; Darius the Mede, in B.C. 493, took possession of the realm of the Chaldeans, being about sixty-two years of age, and that Nabopolassar ceased to reign, and his son Nebuchadnezzar began to reign alone in B.C. 579-8" (*J. S. L.*, January, 1857, p. 454). Of these three dates, that which assigns B.C. 493 to Darius the Mede is perhaps the most wild and untenable. And of Mr. Bosanquet's four dates in the history of Persia, the only rational one is, that Cyrus king of Persia, and

lem, in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, after the temple had been completely rebuilt, and the city wall and gates had been thoroughly restored. Surely your correspondent will allow that a little "further consideration" is needful here also, to judge how far it can be held consistently with the testimony of ancient sacred and secular history, that the victory of Cyrus over Astyages, and the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, occurred in one and the same year, that year being 560 B.C. Which of these two events will he remove from this date? will he return to his former second¹ thoughts, and raise the date of the fall of Jerusalem some years higher than that which Demetrius has assigned?

I would willingly think myself mistaken in supposing that the language of your correspondent's letter on Nehemiah the Tirshatha, was intended to imply what it fairly expresses. But surely it is impossible to misunderstand the language of the following extract from Mr. Bosanquet's letter on "Scripture Chronology" inserted in a former number of this Journal (Oct. 1860, p. 180).

"Fourthly, I might dwell upon a fact, which has been frequently before pointed out, viz.:—that 'Nehemiah the Tirshatha, and Ezra the priest the scribe, (Neh. viii. 9, 14, 17), *were both present at the FIRST FEAST OF TABERNACLES kept at Jerusalem after the return from cap-*

¹ Mr. Bosanquet in his letter on "Scripture Chronology" (*J. S. L.*, Oct. 1860, p. 175) thus writes:—"I conceive that the chronology of Demetrius must be rectified in conformity with the contents of the opening of the first chapter of the book of Ezekiel, which records that the thirtieth year either of the reign of Nabopolassar, as Scaliger supposes, or of the era of Scythian domination, coincided with the fifth year of Jeconiah's captivity, and with the thirteenth year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, thus raising the first year of that king's reign from 578 to B.C. 592, *and the fall of Jerusalem from 562 to B.C. 574.* I abandon also the idea that the regnal years of Darius the Median are to be counted in Scripture from the time when he took the kingdom at the age of about sixty-two" Mr. Bosanquet has since very wisely retracted a concession very unwisely based upon an unintelligible interpretation of the opening of the first chapter of Ezekiel. He now holds that Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, and Astyages conquered by Cyrus, in one and the same year, B.C. 560—and that Nebuchadnezzar (who, as he elsewhere allows, reigned 43 years) began to reign in B.C. 578, therefore died B.C. 536-5, about two years after the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus. When Mr. Bosanquet held that the regnal years of Darius the Median are to be counted in Scripture from the time when he took the kingdom, (of the Chaldeans, in B.C. 493) he must also have held that the temple, which was finished in the *sixth* of Darius, was finished cir. B.C. 487, about three years *after the battle of Marathon*, and about two years before the death of Darius. If he still rejects this wild notion, we presume that he holds that it was cir. B.C. 521-20, in the second year of Darius, that Zerubbabel and Jeshua, encouraged by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, resumed the work of the temple. If so, it must have been some years *before* the second of Darius (B.C. 521-20)—why not **EARLIER** than 530, B.C.?—that the first feast of tabernacles was held at Jerusalem after the return from the captivity (Ezra iii. 4) under Zerubbabel the Tirshatha, and Jeshua the high priest. At this feast Mr. Bosanquet tells us were present also Nehemiah, the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah, and Ezra the priest the scribe. We know that these two were also present at the celebration of the feast of tabernacles in B.C. 444 (eighty-five years later than B.C. 530), when Eliashib was high-priest. Your correspondent does not say that Zerubbabel and Jeshua were present at this latter feast of tabernacles. And how does he prove that Nehemiah was a priest at all?

tivity, and that they both sealed the covenant, together with the same lists of priests who came up from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii. 7, 65; viii. 9; x. 1), and that Nehemiah was yet living in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 433, (xiii. 6) and Ezra in the twentieth year (B.C. 445), so that if Zerubbabel and *these* priests (including Nehemiah the Tirshatha and Ezra) came to Jerusalem in the first year of Cyrus it is impossible that the first of Cyrus could be so early as B.C. 536, as generally supposed. In other words, the reign of Cyrus must have partly at least coincided with the reign of Darius Hystaspes."

Immediately after this your correspondent rather naively writes—"So much for the difficulties in Scripture chronology, as regards the reigns of Cyrus and Darius, involved in the common mode of reckoning." Certainly, *if* (Mr. Bosanquet wisely puts the case hypothetically) Zerubbabel, Jeshua the high-priest, Nehemiah the Tirshatha and Ezra the priest and scribe, were all present *at the first feast of tabernacles after the return from the captivity;*" there are indeed no ordinary difficulties involved in the common mode of reckoning. At the same time it is only fair to allow that *if* Nehemiah the Tirshatha *never came to Jerusalem until the twentieth of Artaxerxes*, B.C. 445—(not to mention the fact that Ezra is not presented unto us as an influential person until the seventh of Artaxerxes, B.C. 457)—it will follow that Zerubbabel and Jeshua did not celebrate the first feast of tabernacles after the return from Babylon, until the twentieth of Artaxerxes, B.C. 445, on which supposition the reign of Cyrus must have coincided with the whole of that of Darius Hystaspes, and of his son Xerxes, and partly at least (*i.e.*, with the first twenty years) with the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. On this supposition, therefore, no ordinary difficulties are involved in Mr. Bosanquet's mode of reckoning.

I will terminate^m this discussion by transcribing here the conclusion

^m I will also close my notes with one or two extracts. "I venture to think that the more the matter is sifted the more impossible it will appear to consider that 'Darius the Mede,' and Darius Hystaspes are one and the same person" (Mr. Savile's letter on "Darius the Mede and Darius Hystaspes," *J. S. L.*, April, 1857). "There is no real difficulty in regard to the age of Daniel, if, while we associate the prophet with Darius the Mede, we keep him at a due distance from Darius Hystaspes; the former being, according to Daniel, about sixty-two years of age, when the latter was, according to Herodotus, about fourteen or fifteen years old. We must be careful also not to make Daniel, when his life would have already extended beyond one hundred and five years, become the prime minister of Darius Hystaspes, in B.C. 493. Nor is it according to the received rules of historical criticism, to make Darius Hystaspes (cir. B.C. 535), when not yet nineteen years old, to be the prince (sar) of the kingdom of Persia, who is mentioned Dan. x. 13" (*J. S. L.*, April, 1861, p. 175). Mr. Bosanquet has had different views at different times, (1) that Jerusalem was destroyed B.C. 560; (2) that this destruction took place fourteen years earlier, in B.C. 574. On the former supposition, Daniel would have reached his hundred and third year in B.C. 493; on the latter he would have reached his hundred and seventeenth year in 493—a preposterous age to be made prime minister over a realm of one hundred provinces. I mention this that your correspondent *may be on his guard* when he next carries back the date of the destruction of Jerusalem by fourteen years, to carry back also the date of the taking of the kingdom

of my letter on Nehemiah the Tirshatha, inserted in the January number of this Journal, p. 449.

“I do not for a moment doubt that your correspondent sincerely believed that he was correct in assuming the Nehemiah of Zerubbabel to be identical with Nehemiah the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah. I cannot however but think that, if Mr. Bosanquet will once more examine the sacred writers in reference to this subject, he will not refuse to allow that he was in error when he penned the following assertions:—‘Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, (the Tirshatha) who was living in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 433, (and several years later) also sealed the covenant with those priests who came up from Babylon to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel, as is supposed in the reign of Cyrus; Cyrus must have died, *therefore*, later than B.C. 530.’”

May 23, 1862.

A CONSTANT READER.

P.S. When large hosts made Syria a battle-field, and when powerful Persian armies were stationed for some time in Phœnicia and Syria, including Samaria, the Jews unable to defend themselves, would suffer greatly from marauding parties. The envious and hostile Samaritans would have a malicious gratification in exciting the lawless soldiery to harass and pillage their Jewish neighbours. We read in the public confession made by the Levites in behalf of the nation, on the 24th day of the Tisri which immediately followed the Elul, in which Nehemiah completed the restoration of the city wall and gates—“Behold, we are servants this day, and for the land that Thou gavest unto our father to eat the fruits thereof, behold we are servants in it. And it yieldeth much increase unto the kings whom Thou hast set over us because of our sins; *also they have dominion over our bodies, and over our cattle at their pleasure, and we are in great distress*,” Neh. ix. 36, 37. We are not to suppose that this “great distress” arose from deliberate acts of tyranny on the part of the Persian monarchs. The following extract from Jahn’s *Hebrew Commonwealth*, will illustrate this. “If we recollect that in the years B.C. 459 and 458, Syria and Phœnicia had already been the rendezvous of two armies, when (in 459) Achæmenides, a brother of the king Artaxerxes, was slain in battle by Inarus the ruler of Egypt, and (in 458) an army of three hundred thousand Persians held their rendezvous in Syria and Phœnicia, where the troops were exercised in arms *almost a whole year*—and that in B.C. 448 and 447, Megabyzus himself had waged war in Syria against Longimanus, and twice defeated the royal forces that were sent against him, we need enquire no further for the causes of the decline of the Hebrew colony in Judæa, which had been so well regulated by Ezra. Nehemiah, the cup-bearer of Artaxerxes, learned the unhappy state of the Hebrews, B.C. 444, from a certain Jew named Hanani, who had come from Judæa to Shushan with a caravan.”

It should be here observed that Jahn erroneously held that Ezra the

by Darius the Mede, and the appointment of Daniel to be his prime minister, at least fourteen years earlier than B.C. 493; otherwise his chronological reckoning will be involved in greater difficulties.

priest, the scribe, came to Jerusalem, not in the seventh of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 457, but in the seventh of his father Xerxes, B.C. 478. An attempt, and it is hoped not altogether an unsuccessful one, was made in a former number of this Journal to shew that Jahn erred in this view. (See *Kai Khosru and Ahasuerus*, *J. S. L.*, July, 1860, p. 405, 411.)

BIBLE TRANSLATION.

THERE are few persons who will not agree in the terms of eulogy on the English Bible with which the article on that subject commences in the number of the *J. S. L.* for April of this year. "It is a glorious book, and no doubt, to its possession and free circulation, we owe no small measure of that intelligence, manliness, and liberty by which we are distinguished." May it not be added, also, that we are mainly indebted to it for the rational appreciation of those sublime strains which so inimitably express either the sufferings of its Redeemer, or the mighty works of the Lord in the land of Egypt. In a thoroughly Roman Catholic country this would be next to an impossibility. Should we not, then, value every word of a version which so admirably and effectually enlists the finer and nobler feelings of our nature on behalf of revealed religion?

But there is a strong wish expressed by many persons that a revision of this version should be set on foot. Now, I am far from denying that according to the law of humanity, there is nothing but is subject to change at some period, or which it may not be "necessary to change, time being the greatest innovator," without our will, or even consent. In the case before us, it would seem but fitting that we should endeavour to take a clear and dispassionate view of the actual state of its question, and all its attendant circumstances.

First, it is said, in the words of the article above-mentioned, that a revision of our version is needed from the changes which the language has undergone since 1611. "Undoubtedly it has changed like others; but is it necessary to infer that it has changed so much that the great mass of its people (its poor especially) find any difficulty in comprehending its peculiar words and phrases, which are considered to be obsolete by those who are accustomed to the language of modern literature?" Because some words and idioms have died out among ourselves, it by no means follows as a necessary consequence, that they have become obsolete among the poor.

Why do clergymen frequently find so much difficulty in bringing the language of their discourses down to the level of the poorer members of their flock, or, in other words, of "approximating without vulgarity" to the idiom of its Authorized Version? Plainly because they write and speak, on all "other" occasions, in the language of Queen Victoria, and not in that of King James. But the Bible of that reign is the "literature" of the poor. Nothing then could be more injudicious, except under the strong plea of *necessity*, than to modernize words and phrases to which they have been accustomed from their childhood. You might as well modernize the *Pilgrim's Progress*!

But, say the advocates of revision, "Modern researches in philology, and other departments of science, have thrown fresh light upon the meaning of many Greek and Hebrew words which, at the time our version was executed, were misunderstood." Undoubtedly, and to scholars and to persons "generally" well educated, who may have turned their attention to the subject of biblical literature, "it would doubtless be very gratifying to see a revision in which such emendations could be embodied." But it is to be feared that the "danger" of introducing the emendation would be greater than the "profit" to be derived.

How are the mass of general readers to become acquainted with the *various reasons* for the substitution of "other" words and phrases than those which they have always been in the habit of seeing? To its poor especially, the present Authorized Version is as the "Scriptures in its original" to the scholar. It is to them the word of God in all its integrity. Take any tolerably well-informed tradesman of a higher class than those just mentioned, and tell him that the labours of Bentley, Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Scrivener have corrected, in many points, our hitherto defective text. The very simple admission that the book which he has, perhaps, been always accustomed to look up to and to reverence is "defective," will not certainly tend to improve the tone of his Christianity. And yet, "if" you amend, you must give some "reason" for the emendation.

We are told also that "the number of new translations of the whole or of parts of the Scriptures which have been published," is another consideration, especially considering that of some of these versions large impressions and sundry editions have been sold. But in many cases these versions were not undertaken by members of the Church of England, and if they were, yet by persons who had little reverence for her fundamental principles. Locke, though a member of our church, had a strong tendency to Socinianism. The authors of the improved version of 1808 were Unitarians, as is also Mr. Sharpe. Dr. Benisch is a Jew. Of Dr. Conquest's version, the writer candidly admits that, though the sale was large, its translation was worthless in a critical point of view, while it exhibits renderings which *indicate a doctrinal bias*. And this is the key to the origin of many of these versions, like that which was undertaken on the other side of the Atlantic to promote the peculiar views of the Baptists.* A sect or party likes to see its own views "embedded" in the Scripture text.

Again, with respect to the Old Testament, another argument against a revision may be adduced from the circumstance, that the clergy of our church at the present day have, in the majority of instances, little

* Nothing can be a stronger instance of this than Dr. Benisch's translation of Psalm xi. 12, which he renders—"Kiss a pure one, lest he be angry, and ye wander from its right way, for his wrath easily burneth! O happiness of them that trust in him!" If the translator is elsewhere commended for being *literal*, he may here aspire to the praise of attaining to a figurative mode of speech, which, to say the truth, borders upon nonsense. To improve upon the A. V., by the conceits of the Talmud, will not render the opponents of revision more favourable to it.

or no acquaintance with the Hebrew language. Till this be otherwise, to talk of a revision would be simply absurd. By whom is it to be made? An important question, considering that among all our divines the number of those who are capable of conducting it are too easily reckoned. Are Drs. Pusey and M'Caul to represent the whole Anglican body? with the assistance of the learned canon of Westminster, and the editor of the *J. S. L.* in their knowledge of Syriac. How would the clergy be enabled to form a judgment as to the merit or demerit of the emendations proposed by the translation? Such a revision, therefore, *must be postponed* till a more general knowledge of the sacred language is diffused amongst us. In these critical and enquiring days, or indeed at any day, it is improbable to suppose that even the English people, excluding the clergy, would be satisfied that a revision should be commenced when the labourers are so few, and so little weight consequently could be attached to their proposed emendations.

But it may be said it is quite otherwise with the New Testament. Not exactly so, if the opinions expressed by the writer in an article on the "Results and Progress of Textual Criticism," in the *Christian Remembrancer* for April of the present year, have any foundation in fact. He says: "Dr. Tregelles' valuable treatises and Dr. Davidson's, no less than Mr. Scrivener's, are full of debateable topics. Nor do we complain of this: these learned men have only yielded to the inevitable condition of the subject they treat. We have been calling it the science of textual criticism in deference to their own nomenclature; but their science is only susceptible of so honourable a designation by courtesy. After all the excellent labours and ingenious speculations of such worthies as Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, Griesbach, Matthæi, Hug, Scholz, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Scrivener, textual criticism is little more than a repertory of unsorted facts,

"Rudis indigestaque moles."

with no certain principles, if this word be pressed to its exact sense of fixed truths, leading to scientific laws as opposed to empirical hypothesis." Now this opinion may be exaggerated; but at any rate it does not afford much encouragement to enter upon a revision of the New Testament, though venerable MSS. may have been discovered and collated, so that we have unquestionably a "more accurate" text than is represented by the authorized translation. Yet "it is true that the *substantial* integrity of the work remains *unimpeached*, but its casual defects are not denied." This is a consolatory assurance; and, joined to the fact that sacred criticism is yet in a "transition state," may well make us pause before the work of revision is entered upon.

But even the progress which has been already made might prove in "one" respect dangerous in no slight degree, unless the revisers previously made up their minds to "disavow any omissions" in the text which yet would seem to be justified on sound critical principles. I allude particularly to the text of the three heavenly witnesses, which is now universally acknowledged to have been intruded into its genuine text, which is indeed much better without it. Yet its omission would produce

effects which can hardly be contemplated without dismay. What a triumph for the opponents of our Lord's divinity, and what a disastrous effect would be produced upon the minds of the unlearned. If such an omission were carried out, it must be so in the Prayer Book as well as in the New Testament. What the effect would be of the omission in the epistle for the first Sunday after Easter on the assembled congregation may be easily imagined.

But we are told that the Authorized Version is not only at variance with the great Uncial MSS. in isolated words, but "in whole sentences and paragraphs." This is a formidable prospect if a perfectly correct one. Who can calculate the harvest of scepticism and infidelity which would be brought to light by a revision of the Authorized Version granting the truth of the assertion.

Lastly, we must not omit from our consideration that our version as it exists at present is, as it were, the common property, the received text of all Protestants "wherever" the English language is spoken. Baptists, Methodists, Independents, the Established Church of Scotland as well as of England, know no other whether at home or in the colonies. Make a revision, and you at once break this link; for it is the most improbable of all suppositions, that those who differ from the Church of England would use a version of her revising. Could the Church act conjointly with ministers of the various denominations, on the supposition that some of them were men of learning, and willing to assist in the work? Every reflecting person must admit, who is sincerely attached to her principles, that such a procedure would lower her prestige and influence to such an extent as most materially to injure her spiritual character.

But if a revision is insisted upon, at least let it be deferred till our clergy are better acquainted with the Hebrew language, and till the criticism of the New Testament is settled upon something like a firm basis. Yet it may be feared that years might pass away before the revised version would gain the same hold upon the affections of the people. As a literary work (for in this light it must also be viewed) the omission or alteration of a word by rendering it in the "modern" vernacular, would as thoroughly injure the general effect in the "eighteenth chapter of the first book of Kings," for instance, or in St. Paul's noble description of charity, as the scraping an ancient statue would obliterate all its fine proportions and delicately rendered outline. Shakespeare "modernized" would be as effective on the minds and feelings of the audience in a "theatre" as the revised version would be on that of the congregation in the "church" in deteriorating beauty of expression and elevation of sentiment.

May 31st, 1862.

H. P.

REPLIES TO "ESSAYS AND REVIEWS."

I AM pleased to find from the Rev. H. J. Rose's letter in your July number, that his *profound contempt for arrogant assertions* is not intended as an "attack upon Dr. Williams;" that *imbecile weakness*

and barefaced impudence is applied to a line of argument, and not to "Dr. Williams ;" of course, therefore, unless Mr. Rose means to make a distinction without a difference, not to Dr. Williams's line of argument; and that *subterfuge and quibble* are not applied to anything advanced "by Dr. Williams."

To the use of the phrases, *puerile attack*, and *paltry attack*, and *rash assertion*, as applied to the learned doctor, Mr. Rose seems to plead guilty. I am quite content, however, to leave it to your readers to decide whether he rightly understands the bearing of his own words, and whether it would not be better that strong vituperative language should disappear from the page of controversy.

I beg leave to assure Mr. Rose that when I said a certain critical statement of his was "not true," I merely meant that it was not accurate and correct to describe the word Shiloh as a translation. This word being given in the original, leaves the ordinary reader under an impression that it can only be the name of a person, which may, or may not, be explained. In accordance with Messianic interpretations of this passage, it should be rendered either (1) *the peaceable one*, or *the peace bringer*, or (2) *He who shall be sent*, or (3) *He to whom it belongs*. But each of them, so far as I can see, is very far-fetched and exegetically untenable. Even Delitzsch rejects the interpretation which makes Shiloh a proper name of Messiah (*Commentary*, p. 593). "It has neither authority nor parallel in the Scriptures," says the late Professor Lee (*Heb. Lex.*). The syntax and sense of the passage appears to me to be settled by 1 Sam. iv. 12, "*There ran a man of Benjamin from the battle, and came to Shiloh.*" The words are the same in Hebrew as in the text under consideration; the meaning of which is simply this, that *a leadership* should attach to the tribe of Judah from the time when he should arrive at that famous city. Gesenius quotes other texts corroborative of this interpretation, to which should be added 1 Chron. v. 2.

CLERICUS.

BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY.

THE recent discovery in the British Museum, by Sir Henry Rawlinson, from the *debris* of the royal library at Nineveh, is of extreme importance to Biblical chronology. Four independent copies of a list of annual functionaries who exercised high office in the kingdom of Assyria, interspersed with the names of Assyrian kings, such as Tiglath Pileser, Sargon, Shalmanezer, and Sennacherib, in their order of succession, have thrown so much light upon the dynastic changes at that time in the Assyrian empire, and have led to such opposite inferences by Assyrian scholars, that I take the liberty of drawing the attention of your readers to the interesting and critical position in which the question of Biblical chronology is now placed. In doing this I shall have occasion also to remark on the letter of your correspondent, "Constant Reader," in the *J. S. L.*, July, p. 456, who has taken upon himself the difficult task of upholding the commonly received dates.

In the *J. S. L.* of January, 1857, p. 453, I drew attention to a letter of Sir Gardner Wilkinson, in the *Monthly Review* of October, 1856, in which he pointed out how the discoveries of Monsieur Mariette in the tombs of the sacred bulls buried in the Serapium at Memphis, had proved that the reign of Tirhakah in Egypt, the prince who fought with Sennacherib in the days of Hezekiah, immediately preceded the reign of Psammetichus, and how this discovery "*would bring the expedition of Sennacherib much later than in the Bible chronology.*" This important chronological discovery appeared to me at that time so strikingly confirmatory of the views I had published in 1853, in a work entitled, *Fall of Nineveh*, in which I had argued, from Demetrius and other original authorities, that the expedition of Sennacherib should be placed in the year B.C. 688-9, some twenty years lower than in the received chronology,—the capture of Samaria by Shalmanezar in B.C. 696,—the ninth year of Menchem in B.C. 736,—and the first year of Solomon in B.C. 993, that I ventured to predict^o that from henceforth we should hear little more of the old conventional dates of Bible chronology. Since that time, Lepsius, fully impressed with the value of Mariette's discoveries, and looking at the question from an Egyptian point of view, has in his *Königsbuch der Alten Ägypter*, published in 1858, placed the first year of Solomon in B.C. 992,—the last year of Menahem in B.C. 739—the fall of Samaria in B.C. 698—and the expedition of Sennacherib in B.C. 691—years all closely approximating to the dates which I had fixed.

The publication of a portion of the Assyrian canon, by Sir H. Rawlinson, in the *Athenæum* of the 19th July, enables us now to examine the subject from an independent Assyrian point of view, and the result of the examination I submit, to any impartial judge, must be to confirm these lower dates. If any one will refer to the canon, and to the dates affixed by Sir Henry himself, on the unexceptionable grounds of astronomical authority, he will find that the eighth year of Tiglath Pileser, and of the payment of tribute by Uzziah and

^o Your correspondent G., alias G. B., alias Constant Reader, alias late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, rejoices to find that my prediction is not verified. I am content to admit the failure of my prophecy, nor am I disposed to disturb the felicity of those who may be the last to discover that the ground has sunk beneath their feet. But in a foot-note, p. 457, he endeavours to depreciate the testimony of Demetrius upon which I much rely, and which has now been so remarkably confirmed, by classing his authority with that of certain Talmudical doctors who lived 400 years after him, and adds, "If Demetrius flourished so early as B.C. 222, it would probably be mere want of correct information, united with undue attachment to some favourite chronological hypothesis, which led him into his error." He does not inform us how he arrives at these assumed probabilities. Is it not more probable that your correspondent, who in this same foot note places Ptolemy Philadelphus in B.C. 222, has not fully informed himself of the peculiarly advantageous circumstances under which Demetrius was placed, as living soon after Berosus, Manetho, Menander, Eratosthenes, and the writer of the Parian chronicle, all of whom had applied their minds to the investigation of the chronology of the time which preceded them. A copy even of the very Assyrian canon to which we have referred, the copies of which were probably very numerous, and amongst the records probably of many libraries, may have come into his hands.

Menahem, is now admitted to be B.C. 738; that from the mutilated remains of the name of Shalmanezzer in B.C. 698, we may infer that he may have captured Samaria in B.C. 696, after a three years siege, as stated in the Book of Kings,—and that the first year of Sennacherib, according to copy number one of the canon, is B.C. 689.

The establishment of these three leading dates is, in fact, the establishment of the whole outline of Scripture chronology laid down in 1853, by counting upwards from them in accordance with the historical Hebrew books to the first year of Solomon, B.C. 993, and downwards to the birth of Christ, B.C. 3, provided that the figures in the Hebrew text are left intact. But to throw doubt upon these figures will probably be the next phase of the Bible chronology controversy. Lepsius, following the suggestion of Niebuhr, proposes to strike out twenty years from the reign of Manasseh, king of Judah, by which means all the dates below this point may be left unaltered, while the dates above may correspond with the Assyrian canon: while Sir Henry Rawlinson, who has done more than any man living towards the recovery of the true dates, is disposed to alter the evidence of the Book of Kings by lapping one over the other the reigns of Uzziah and Jotham, kings of Judah. Dr. Hincks, whose learning and ingenuity are unbounded, and who is more fully alive than most men to the difficulties into which Persian chronology will be plunged, if the correctness of the Assyrian canon be once admitted, appears to have been thrown into a state of the most indescribable confusion. If Tiglath Pileser began to reign, as fixed by the Assyrian canon, in B.C. 745, there will be a discrepancy of between forty and fifty years between Scripture and the arrangement of Dr. Hincks. And Sir Henry already questions whether his “specious identification of the names of the Belibus and Aparanadisus of the canon of Ptolemy, and his pretended verification of their respective reigns at Babylon, will bear a minute scrutiny.” His only refuge, therefore, is to deny the evidence. Accordingly he falls foul of the newly-discovered document at once, as if it were a deadly enemy, and declares that “the compiler of the canon has passed over a period of upwards of thirty years, during which either no Eponymes^p were appointed, or he was unable to discover their names” (*Athenæum*, July 5). This is indeed a bold assertion, when unsupported by a shadow of proof. He also has invented a cycle of eight years, an *octoeteris*, by which to throw doubt upon Sir Henry’s explanation of the canon, concerning which Sir Henry remarks, “There positively is not the remotest foundation for such a notion.” All which tends to prove the extreme disturbance of preconceived chronology occasioned by the discovery of this precious document, the most valuable discovery in chronology which has been made since the finding of the Parian Chronicle in the days of Charles I.

^p Sir H. Rawlinson supposes these annual officers to have been high priests. Dr. Hincks and Dr. Oppert give them the vague title of Eponymes. The list is that of the annually-appointed commanders-in-chief of the army. See Diodorus, *Rhodom.*, ii., p. 108.

In the fullest conviction that the evidence of this document is unassailable, and at the same time decisive of the questions at issue, I will leave this part of the chronological controversy to settle itself. I will also leave the suggestion of Niebuhr and Lepsius, of cutting out twenty years from the reign of Manasseh, for future consideration. No man is more fully competent than Dr. Hincks to shew the fallacy of this position. And I will now proceed to examine some of the difficulties in Persian chronology as connected with Scripture, which will probably form a battle-field for discussion for some years to come, and into which I have already entered with some of your correspondents. Your logical correspondent, "Constant Reader," is more especially bitter and unhappy, that any one should call in question the received mode of adapting Persian history to the Bible, and puts forward one or two arguments which require consideration. I have affirmed, and still most confidently maintain:—

1. That Darius the Mede of Daniel, was Darius the son of Hystaspes.²
2. That the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther, was Cyaxares, son of Astyages.⁷
3. That Cyrus, grandson of Astyages, survived Cambyses, and reigned concurrently with Darius for some years.
4. That the Cyrus of Ctesias, son-in-law of Astyages, reigned simultaneously, if not conjointly, with Astyages for some years after his defeat in B.C. 560.⁸

* Your correspondent cannot yet get over the idea of Darius, the Persian, being called a Mede by Daniel, as if the generic term Mede did not comprehend both Persians and Medes down to the time of the Peloponnesian war.

* Your correspondent writes:—"Can any one (who is not biassed by some favourite theory) read the first four verses of the book of Esther, and believe, that the Ahasuerus, who was sovereign lord over 127 provinces from India to Ethiopia, and over the power of Persia and Media, a glorious kingdom, was only sovereign over a *limited portion* of the vast Medo-Persian empire?" Will the reverend gentleman, when he next reads the book of Esther, remember that what is written Ethiopia in the English version, is *Cush in the Hebrew*. Will he also take into consideration that one of the rivers of Eden, which I presume does not place in Africa, compasseth the *whole land of Cush*. (Gen. ii. 13.) Perhaps he will admit that the same spot retained the same name in the time of Sennacherib, who destroyed the army of a king who reigned near the mouths of the Euphrates and Tigris, *in the plains of Cush*. And he may be induced perhaps to believe that the same land, even in the present day, retains the very same name, Cush-istan, or land of Cush. Now, since Ahasuerus reigned at Susa, the capital of this land of Cush, it does not seem very unreasonable, but on the contrary, reasonable to believe that Ahasuerus reigned over territories extending from India to Cushistan. More especially when we consider that Mordecai, the contemporary of Ahasuerus, was carried away captive in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar, so that Ahasuerus was living before Egypt and African Ethiopia were subject to the Persian empire.

* Your correspondent charges me with "drawing conclusions contradictory to the premises" from Ctesias. He quotes a version of Ctesias, in which there are many omissions, shewing that he has not consulted the original, and erroneously supposes that Astyages, instead of Cyrus, went to war with the Bactrians. The following is the original text:—"Καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Ἀμύτιν πρότερον μὲν μητρικῆς ἀπολαῦσι τιμῆς, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ εἰς γυναῖκα ἀχθῆναι τῷ Κύρῳ, Σπιταμᾷ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἀνηρημένου, ὅτι ἐψεύσατο ἀγνοεῖν εἰπὼν ἐρευνώμενον Ἀστυγάῳ. Ταῦτα λέγει

5. That the Lydo-Median war was terminated by the solar eclipse of B.C. 585.³

In addition to these strange opinions, your correspondent observes, that I now “come forward, under the alleged patronage of Sir I. Newton, with a still more daring hypothesis, viz., that ‘the congregation of them which were *come again out of captivity*,’ (Neh. vii. 17,) must be identified with ‘the children of the province *that went up out of the captivity*,’ (Neh. vii. and Ezra ii. 1,) i.e. that the feast of tabernacles recorded in Neh. vii. 15—17, was identical with the feast of tabernacles recorded in Ezra iii. 3, 4, and 6.” “If there be anything clear, he observes, in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, it is that the feast of tabernacles of Ezra iii. 4, was kept in the first or second of Cyrus’ reign over Babylon, (according to Newton, B.C. 536—5,) and that the feast of tabernacles of Nehemiah viii. 16, 17, was kept in the twentieth or twenty-first of Artaxerxes, (according to Newton, B.C. 445-4,) there being an interval of about ninety years between them. So much for the identity of the two festal celebrations in question.”

I believe your correspondent to be in error in both these propositions. His argument is:—First, That the children of the province (Ezra ii. 1) kept the feast of tabernacles, without city to shelter or wall to protect them, before the foundation of the temple was laid; that there were at that time no streets, nor gates, nor fortified wall, nor comfortably-finished houses; and that the event took place before Ezra had returned from Babylon. Secondly, That the feast of tabernacles (Neh. viii. 16, 17,) was kept when the temple had been *completely rebuilt*; that there were several inhabited houses, regular streets, and also *gates* in the city wall, implying that the *wall had been fully restored*; and that the time was after the arrival of Ezra, in the reign of Artaxerxes, and after the building of the wall by Nehemiah. The argument is good, if the facts may be admitted. Now it may be admitted, that at the time of the feast described in the book of Ezra, the foundation of the temple was not laid; there were no gates, no fortified wall. But that there were no streets, no city to shelter, no finished houses, your correspondent will find it difficult to prove, considering that Jeremiah, not long after the destruction of Jerusalem,

Κτησίας περί Κυρού, καὶ οὐχ οἷα Ἡρόδοτος. Καὶ ὅτι πρὸς Βακτρίους ἐπολέμησε, καὶ ἀγχώματος ἢ μάχης ἐγένετο. Ἐπεὶ δὲ Βάκτριοι Ἀστυίαν μὲν πατέρα Κύρου γεγεννημένον, Ἀμύτιν δὲ μητέρα καὶ γυναῖκα ἔμαθον, ἑαυτοὺς ἐκόντες Ἀμύτι καὶ Κύρῳ παρέδοσαν. . . . Ἀστυίαν δὲ μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἐτάφη.”—(Müller’s *Ctesias*, p. 46.) So that Astyages was not treated as a captive, but as an equal. He retained kingly power, and was buried magnificently, after reigning simultaneously with Cyrus for some years. So far also from being placed in a “position very near akin to that of a subject of Cyrus,” Justin, who evidently had the narrative of Ctesias before him, writes:—“Nepotemque in illo magis, quam victorem egit: cumque maximæ genti Hyrcanarum præposuit. Nam in Medos reverti ipse noluit.” (L. i. 6.) There is nothing here which precludes the idea of a change from Median supremacy to Medo-Persian equality. Cyrus, indeed, was *primus inter pares*, but his subjects submitted to his rule from their sense of allegiance to Astyages.

‘Your correspondent is perhaps still satisfied that the description given by Herodotus of this eclipse, was merely his exaggeration of the effects of a great thunder storm; for he has ceased to argue concerning this event and date.

describes it as inhabited, though by persons in a state of great misery. "Her gates are sunk in the ground;" "he hath given up into the hands of the enemy the walls of her palaces;" "the elders of the daughters of Zion sit upon the ground;" "the children swoon in the streets of the city."

He will find it equally difficult to prove that the *temple*, i. e. the sanctuary, or palace of Jehovah, הֵיכָל, had been *completely rebuilt* at the time of the feast, in the book of Nehemiah, on the sole ground that booths were then made "in the courts of the *house of God*." He is not aware of the distinction between the *temple*, or sanctuary, and the *house of the Lord*, which is well exemplified in the passage, "and brought out all the uncleanness that they found in the *temple* of the Lord into the court of the *house of the Lord*" (2 Chron. xxix. 16). No one can doubt that the house of God, that is, "the house of the tabernacle," as in the days of David, had been pitched, even from the time of the first return under Sheshbazzar, in which all the duties of the house of God had been performed, and where chambers were provided for the priests' vestments, and for the vessels of the sanctuary, and for the flour, oil, and wine, etc. (see 1 Chron. ix. 21—29); nor can any one doubt that this tabernacle would have been designated "the house of God," (v. 26). But not one word do we yet find concerning the *temple*, or palace of God, the use of which word might have gone some way to prove your correspondent's assumption.

Again, it is an extremely forced and unjustifiable inference, that because "the street of the water-gate," and "the street of the gate of Ephraim," are mentioned as the places of assembly, at the time of this feast, that the actual gates, therefore, in the city wall, and the wall of the city itself must have been already fully restored. The primary meaning of the word שַׁעַר, here used, is opening, or entrance; it is only in its secondary sense that it signifies the actual gate or bars which close the entrance. So that the entrance of Ephraim, and the water-entrance, is all that the word necessarily implies. For all, then, that your correspondent has stated to the contrary, there were inhabited houses, and streets in the one case, and inhabited houses and streets in the other. The walls and gates of the city were wanting in one case, and may have been equally so in the other. The temple, or sanctuary, was not rebuilt in the one case, nor is there evidence of its having been built in the other. But the one thing of which the evidence is certain; the one thing upon which Sir Isaac Newton has placed his finger, as certain, is, that the priests which came up with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii. 1) out of captivity from Babylon, who also sealed the covenant with Ezra and Nehemiah (x. 1), were present at this feast of tabernacles; and moreover, as I have observed, that they formed part of "the congregation of them who had come again out of the captivity" with Zerubbabel, not part of a congregation living ninety years later, who had never been in captivity.

Your correspondent naturally feels the great weight of Newton's name as opposed to his opinions in this matter, and condescends to repeat the silly story of the large aperture for the cat, and the small

aperture for the kitten, with a view, as he supposes, of depreciating the reasoning of the great mathematician.⁴

This is literally for the present the only answer given by him to Newton's reasoning; and he who can condescend to resort to such a mode of attack, exposes himself to the inference that he is reduced to the very last shift for an argument. Your correspondent has reserved the great force of his logic, however, to crush the idea, that the feast of tabernacles in the days of Nehemiah was celebrated by the congregation of those who, having been in captivity at Babylon, had now returned from the province to Jerusalem out of their captivity. He truly observes, that when Ezra speaks of "the children of the province that went up out of the captivity," there were comprehended under that expression many "ancient men" who had seen the old temple; that is to say, many fathers and grandfathers of some of those *children* of the province who had returned. Why then, he asks, should I persist in supposing that the words "congregation of them that were come again out of captivity," when used by Nehemiah, must necessarily be spoken of the very individuals who actually came up from Babylon to Jerusalem, and not of their grandchildren?" In other words, if "*children* that went up out of captivity," signified fathers and grandfathers who went up out of captivity, why should not "congregation come again out of captivity," signify children and grandchildren of that congregation who had never been in captivity? There is something ludicrous in the idea, that the writings of Ezra and Nehemiah should be open to so grotesque an inference: but the reader will readily detect that the inference rests entirely upon the literal construction put by your correspondent on the word "children." Every reader of the Bible is aware that "children of Zion" signifies merely people of Zion; "children of the prophets," signifies merely prophets; "children of men," men; and that "children of light," "children of wrath," "children of promise," and such like expressions, are common Hebrew modes of expression having no reference to offspring or descendants. "Children of the province," therefore, merely signifies they of the province, or, for the convenience of apposition, congregation of them of the province. To assume, then, that because in the mouth of Ezra the

⁴ Your correspondent is always unhappy when he endeavours to handle Newton. We have found him quoting Sir Isaac as supporting his paradoxical notion, that Ahasuerus was Cambyses, and Artaxerxes Smerdis, which Newton expressly denies. He has also been asked, though he declines to tell us, why he considers that "Newton would almost certainly have rejected the notion that the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah, the cupbearer of Longimanus, is to be identified with the Nehemiah who came to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel," knowing, as we do, that Newton believed Nehemiah the Tirshatha to have been present with Zerubbabel at Jerusalem. His great logical conception, however, that "those who came out of captivity" at Babylon, signified those who lived ninety years after, and were never in captivity at Babylon, transcends anything which ever entered into the head of Newton to conceive. It is an honour, no doubt, to be styled late Fellow of Trinity. But are there no special honours, no suitable letters in the alphabet to express the honours due to such a Fellow as this?

words—congregation of them of the province that went up out of the captivity,—truly represent those, and none but those, who had passed their weary sojourn in captivity in the province of Babylon, therefore the same words in the mouth of Nehemiah should represent those, and none but those, who had probably never seen the province, or wept in bondage by the waters of Babylon, is a burlesque mode of reasoning, which reminds us of the ingenious argument which identifies the chesnut horse with the horse chesnut—reasoning which may indeed disturb our sense of universal gravity, but which will not go far to subvert the Newtonian theory of the historical contents of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Your correspondent, then, appears to have failed in establishing the one thing clear in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, viz., that the feast of tabernacles, (Ezra iii. 4,) was kept in the reign of Cyrus, and the feast of tabernacles, (Nehem. viii. 16, 17,) was kept in the reign of Artaxerxes; and I have frequently exposed the contradictions involved in his chronology. I will now assume for the moment the correctness of my own mode of reckoning the chronology, and give some reasons for believing that these feasts were one and the same—celebrated in one and the same month—and that this month was neither in the reign of Cyrus nor of Artaxerxes.

I. The feast of tabernacles first celebrated by the Jews after their return from captivity at Babylon, was celebrated in the presence of Zerubbabel, Jeshua, Nehemiah, Mordecai, and Ezra. (See Ezra ii. 2, iii. 4, Nehem. xii. 1.)

Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel, was grandson by adoption or succession, of king Jechoniah, who in B.C. 575 was carried captive to Babylon, and who was twenty-nine years of age when Jerusalem was destroyed in the year B.C. 564;^u and we hear no more of Zerubbabel after the reign of Darius, say B.C. 482.

Jeshua was son of Josedech, and grandson of Seraiah, the high priest, when Jerusalem was destroyed in B.C. 564, (1 Chron. vi. 10—15;) and we hear no more of Jeshua after the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes, say B.C. 482.

Nehemiah was Nehemiah *the Tirshatha*,^v the son of Hachaliah, the cupbearer of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and was living as late as the thirty-second year of that king's reign B.C. 433, and may have died as late as B.C. 430. (Nehem. vii. 65, viii. 9; 1 Esdras v. 40.)

Mordecai was he who had been carried captive to Babylon with Jeconiah in B.C. 575, when probably a child, who became great at the court of Ahasuerus-Cyaxares II. during the captivity, and who may have been born as early as B.C. 580. (Esther ii. 6, x. 3.)

Ezra was probably great-grandson of Seraiah, who was slain in

^u According to Demetrius.

^v Tirshatha. Hic est Nehemiah. Sec dictus quasi יהודר שרתא qui dispensavit potum. Munster in loco. This is not the word to denote the governor. When Shezbazzar is spoken of as governor, (Ezra v. 14;) when Zerubbabel is spoken of as governor, (vi. 7,) and when Nehemiah is called governor, (xii. 26,) the word מִשְׁתָּר is used, not Tirshatha.

B.C. 564, and was living till after the time of the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, perhaps as late as B.C. 430.

The joint ages of these leaders cover a period of about one hundred and fifty years, from the birth of Mordecai to the deaths of Nehemiah and Ezra. The feast of tabernacles was celebrated, therefore, not later than ninety years after the birth of Mordecai B.C. 490, nor earlier than sixty-five or seventy years before the death of Nehemiah and Ezra, supposing them to have been about thirty or thirty-five years of age at the time B.C. 500—495. It was celebrated, therefore, between B.C. 500 and 490. The clumsy idea, that there were two Nehemiahs, both eminent leaders of the Jews; two Mordecais, both distinguished amongst the captives in the province, and two Ezras; and that one Zerubbabel represents two governors, the first styled Sheshbazzar, the second Zerubbabel himself, has the effect of spreading the few scanty facts related in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, over a period of one hundred instead of about sixty years.

II. The feast was celebrated soon after the arrival of Zerubbabel and Jeshua, with a large body of those "that were come out of the captivity into Jerusalem" (Ezra iii. 4—8.)

Now Zerubbabel was one of the body guard of Darius, son of Hystaspes, *and did not come to Jerusalem till the first year of Darius as king of Assyria*^w (Ezra vi. 22), and Darius had promised him that if ever he should have the kingdom (Josephus, *Ant.*, xi. iii. 7), that is to say, if ever he took the throne of Babylon, he would rebuild Jerusalem. Now we know from the book of Daniel that Darius, son of Ahasuerus, i.e., son by adoption, or successor of Cyaxares, "took the kingdom" of Babylon when "about threescore and two years old," about seventy years after Jerusalem had been laid desolate (Dan. v. 31, ix. 2,) i.e., seventy years after its destruction in B.C. 564. And from the prophet Zechariah (Zech. i. 12), we know also that when Zerubbabel was at Jerusalem in the second year of Darius, son of Hystaspes, these seventy years had just been fulfilled. So that this return of Zerubbabel and Jeshua with the body of captives was in the year B.C. 493, in which year also we know through Ctesias that Darius was about sixty-two years old.

III. Many of the priests and Levites, who had been brought up as boys about the old temple, and who at the age of eight or ten years might have been impressed with the grandeur of the building, at the time of its destruction in B.C. 564, were present at this feast of tabernacles, and wept when the foundations of the new temple were laid, and are spoken of as "*ancient men*" (Ezra iii. 12); and this expression, "ancient men," is applicable to them, if the foundations of the temple were laid in B.C. 492, but not if they were laid in the first year of Cyrus as king of Babylon.

IV. The feast was celebrated just fifteen months before the foundations of the *temple*, that is, of the sanctuary of Jehovah, *הֵיכָל*, were laid (Ezra iii. 6, 10); and we know that the foundation of the Lord's temple

^w "What time he was set over the realm of the Chaldeans," (Dan. xi. 1, 2.)

or sanctuary was laid on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month of the second year of Darius (Haggai ii. 18). So that the feast was celebrated in the seventh month of the first year of Darius, king of Assyria, B.C. 493.

V. Josephus makes no mention of a feast of tabernacles having been kept in the reign of Cyrus. But he does distinctly place the celebration of this feast, and the whole of the third chapter of Ezra, in the first year of Darius, son of Hystaspes (Joseph., *Ant.*, xi. 2, 3.)

VI. The Apocryphal book of Esdras arranges the history in the same manner.

VII. The arrangement of Josephus and Esdras is correct, because the first chapter of Ezra refers to the governorship of Sheshbazzar, the second chapter to the governorship of Zerubbabel. Sheshbazzar, we are told (Ezra v. 16), was engaged in levelling only the literal foundations of the whole area of the house, which was a great undertaking, *וְהָיָה הַבְּנִיָּה כְּמִנְיָן*. Zerubbabel was engaged in building the *temple*, *וְהָיָה הַבְּנִיָּה כְּמִנְיָן*, the sanctuary of Jehovah (Haggai ii. 18). Besides which, it is improbable that any writer in a continuous history, after naming the governor under his title Sheshbazzar, should continue his history a few lines later under another name, without mentioning their identity.

VIII. The third chapter of Ezra refers not to the time of Cyrus, but to the time of Darius, because, as before observed, the laying the foundation of the *temple*, or palace, *וְהָיָה הַבְּנִיָּה*, referred to in Ezra iii. 10, was in the ninth month of the second year of the reign of Darius. It is true, that in the second month of the same year the Levites began to set forward the work of the house, *בַּיָּמִים*, of the Lord, that is, to prepare the ground for laying the foundation (Ezra iii. 8); and again, in the sixth month of the same year, they did work in the house of the Lord, *בַּיָּמִים* that is, on the site of the building (Haggai i. 14). But not one stone was laid upon another of the temple, *וְהָיָה הַבְּנִיָּה*, till the ninth month (Haggai ii. 15; Zech. viii. 9).

IX. In the third chapter of Ezra, ver. 12, reference is made to the "ancient men" who could remember the first temple. These "ancient men" are, also, thus appealed to by Haggai in the reign of Darius (Haggai ii. 3). "Who is left amongst you that saw this house in her first glory?"

X. The fourth chapter of Ezra, from the first to the sixth verse, refers also to the days when the *temple* was rebuilt. But it has commonly been supposed to refer to the time of Cyrus, because the enemies of the Jews are said to have "hired counsellors against them to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus, king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius, king of Persia."

This is the only passage which apparently favours the view of your correspondent. But Josephus considers the words as referring to what had been done "*formerly* in the days of Cyrus" (Jos., *Ant.*, xi., iv., 4), and this is no doubt the proper mode of turning the passage. As in the following verse a *former* complaint in the days of Ahasuerus, the contemporary of Mordecai, is referred to. The second and third chapters, and six first verses of the fourth chapter of Ezra, are

clearly extracts from the same register or history, out of which Nehemiah copied from chap. vii. 5, to xii. 26, the second chapter verbatim, the rest in epitome. They are interpolations, yet rightly interpolated, if we place an interval of upwards of twenty years between the first and second chapters. And thus may the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Josephus, and Esdras, be shewn to be consistent one with the other, but not otherwise.

XI. That the feast of tabernacles (Ezra iii. 4), and the feast of tabernacles (Nehemiah viii.), are one and the same feast is clear, because the Tirshatha, *i. e.*, the cupbearer, the peculiar title of Nehemiah, was present on both occasions (Ezra ii. 63; Nehemiah vii. 65; viii. 9; Esdras. v. 40).

XII. The whole congregation which celebrated the feast was the same on both occasions, and the events of the time seem to have excited the same feeling of joy. For in Ezra iii. 8, we read that "all they that were come out of the captivity unto Jerusalem" were present, and in verses 12, 13, we find them shouting aloud for joy. While in Nehemiah viii. 17, we read that "all the congregation of them that were come up again out of captivity" were present, and that "there was very great gladness.

XIII. Lastly, all the priests who came up with Zerubbabel (Nehemiah xii. 1), are identical with the priests who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah and Ezra at the time of the feast (Nehemiah x. 1), as pointed out by Sir Isaac Newton.

This argument of Newton's clearly indicates that the feast of tabernacles, and the sealing of the covenant, was at the time of the arrival of Zerubbabel, not earlier than about B.C. 493. But being unable to shake off the shackles of the received Persian chronology, he places the return in the reign of Cyrus, thus making the age of Nehemiah upwards of one hundred and twenty years.

Newton, again, saw clearly that the seventy weeks of Daniel ended in the birth of Christ B.C. 3. But, again, hampered by the chronology, was unable to draw the inference that the commencement of these weeks was in B.C. 493.

Newton, constrained by the force of evidence, saw clearly that Darius the Mede of Daniel was the grandson of Astyages who married in the year of the eclipse, B.C. 585, and that Darius was therefore living in the time of Darius, son of Hystaspes. But, thwarted again by his chronology, was compelled to remove the eclipse from the reign of Cyaxares the father, to the reign of Cyaxares the son of Astyages.

All which tends to shew that the real difficulty of the question still lies in the received arrangement of Persian chronology, where the authority of Herodotus is allowed to ride triumphant, setting aside entirely the evidence of Ctesias, and Xenophon regarding Cyrus.

I. W. BOSANQUET.

EXPLANATIONS OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES.

PSALM xlix. 1, 2, etc.

PSALM lxiii. 9.—This verse presents no special difficulty, and may be fairly rendered,—

“ And these seek my soul to destroy it,
They shall come to the lower parts of the earth;
They shall deliver him into the power of the sword,
They shall be the portion of jackals (or foxes).”

I see no reason for thinking that the lower parts of the earth are pits for prisons; they may be either caves or graves for burial. According to Gesenius the expression means Hades (Isaiah xlv. 23), or a secret place (Psalm cxxxix. 15). “Him,” in the third line, seems to mean “each of them.”

Psalm xlix. 1, 2.—This passage has been examined in the *J. S. L.*,^{*} and its sense explained. “Adam” often corresponds to “homo,” and “Ish” to “vir;” the one is generic and the other is specific; the one a more honourable, the other a less honourable designation. That no such distinction as Mr. Sharpe asks about can be implied, is shewn by the fact that the word Adam is applied to all men indiscriminately, to Jews and their forefathers as well as to Gentiles. The phrase, “sons of men,” or “sons of Adam,” is by Fürst, etc., regarded as denoting all who are not Jews.

Deut. xxxii. 8.—In this place the parallelism between the “nations” and “the sons of Adam” wholly tends to confirm the view of Fürst, and the parallelism of the next two lines, “tribes” and “children of Israel,” is all but demonstrative. Over against “nations,” in line 1, we find “tribes,” in line 3; and “the sons of Adam,” in line 2, are contrasted with “the sons of Israel,” in line 4.

The other passages (Gen. iv. 15, and vi. 2) have been frequently discussed, and I will not now meddle with them. If Mr. Sharpe thinks our race is not wholly from one origin, he is not alone; but I think he will find it hard to infer that doctrine from any Biblical text truly interpreted. He may, if he will, see how much can be said for that view in the *Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, issued by the publishers of *J. S. L.*, and about which an interesting discussion was carried on in these pages a few years since. But if he reads the book I hope he will also read the letters which appeared in *J. S. L.* in 1855, and an article in the number for October, 1860.

Q.

PSALM XLIX. 1, 2.

I AM persuaded that Mr. Sharpe will, on a second examination of this verse, and others which he compares with it, acknowledge that his

^{*} *J. S. L.*, July, 1854, p. 371.

interpretation of them is not defensible, and that if the doctrine of there being more than one origin to the human race is to be supported from Scripture at all, stronger proofs than are furnished by these verses must be discovered.

Mr. Sharpe is aware that the Hebrews made the same distinction between אָדָם and אִישׁ as the Latins did between *homo* and *vir*, and that invariably when both are connected, the former means "man of low degree," and the latter, "man of high degree." See Rosenmuller in locis. Compare Isaiah ii. 9, and v. 15, where the prophet uses the same words with reference to the two classes among the same people, *viz.*, the Israelites—and Prov. viii. 4. The latter part of verse 2 in Psalm xlix. is probably meant to be partly an explanation of the former, as is often the case in the metrical portions of Scripture. With regard to Deut. xxxii. 8, it may be sufficient to remind Mr. Sharpe that this song is a metrical composition, and that it was the custom of Hebrew poets to repeat the same idea in different words. I am convinced that nothing more was intended here.

I cannot see that Gen. iv. 15 has much to do with the question, for I do not find any allusion to *strangers* in the text of Scripture.

As regards Genesis vi. 2, it has strangely escaped Mr. Sharpe's notice that the expression, "daughters of men," is in the original בָּנוֹת אָדָם "daughters of *Adam*;" which, if it proves anything, shews that the women have a better right to be connected with Adam than the men.

J. H.

TISCHENDORF *versus* TREGELLES.

ON my return from Leipsic, and other places in Germany, I have stayed for a few days in London; and just before leaving I find for the first time that in the last number of your Journal (issued while I was in Germany) a translation is given of the attacks made on me by Professor Tischendorf in the prolegomena to his Greek Testament of 1859.

I may reasonably ask why the same prominence has not been given to my *published answers*, as has been accorded to Tischendorf's attacks. In the *additions* to my volume of Horne's *Introduction*, edition 2, I said all that I thought necessary; and in the preface to *Codex Zacynthius* I had the satisfaction of mentioning the result of my answer in connexion with Tischendorf himself.

When he was aware of the manner in which he had himself proposed to me to edit the *Codex Claromontanus together*, and when he remembered how I had acted on this proposition, he saw that I could have made no intentional misrepresentation, and when he saw that he had himself allowed me to remain in my mistake (if mistake it was), as to having written to him in 1853 as to my intention of publishing R, he was quite willing to write to me in a thoroughly conciliatory spirit.

It has been at his desire that I have been examining the Codex Sinaiticus; of which he gave me the free use prior to its publication; and of which I availed myself for several days at Leipsic.

It was, therefore, a great surprise to me to see charges reproduced against me which Tischendorf would not now make; and that not in the obscurity of a learned language, but translated into English.

August 27, 1862.

S. P. TREGELLES.

CRITICISM OF JOHN XIX. 10, 11.

I HAVE been somewhat late in seeing *The Journal of Sacred Literature* for January last, and consequently may be somewhat behind hand in the remarks I wish to offer upon the first passage (John xix. 10, 11) discussed in the article entitled, "Exegesis of difficult Texts." If not, however, too late to interest your readers, I offer the following observations.

Perhaps no more unmeaning words were ever uttered at the bar of judgment than *Οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν οὐδεμίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν· διὰ τοῦτο ὁ παραδιδούς μέ σοι μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει*, if they bear no other significance than that assigned them by Semler, S. T. Coleridge, and the writer of the article under review. It is perfectly true that ἄνωθεν may be rendered in the manner proposed, but equally true, that had Pilate so understood it, the whole saying would have seemed to him supremely absurd. In no sense whatever did Pilate receive his jurisdiction from ὁ παραδιδούς, whoever the latter was. His power or jurisdiction was political, and he received it entirely from Rome. It is true that the Jews plotted to transfer our Saviour from their own judgment-hall to Pilate's, because they had not the power of life and death; but equally true that his jurisdiction was entirely independent of theirs. In political matters, Pilate's jurisdiction was the sole jurisdiction. In such matters the Jews had not even the power of taking the first steps. And it was as a political offender our Saviour was condemned. It would have been very strange if, in the late Indian mutiny, any of the rebels had told Lord Canning that he would have had no jurisdiction over them, unless he had received it from some local tribunal which had more to do with the policy of Brahminism than either civil or political affairs. The ruler of a conquered country receives his entire jurisdiction from the country he represents. And Pilate evidently understood his position towards our Saviour in this light. The Jews could not give him the power of life and death. But his own words are, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and I have power to release thee?" He boasts of an authority almost absolute and irresponsible. How absurd, then, would the reply of our Saviour have appeared to Pilate, if it had no other meaning than—"Thou couldest have no power at all against me, unless the Jews had given it to thee." If this be the meaning of our Saviour's reply, it is not easy to say whether it is more impertinent or silly. Pilate knew that he had not received his jurisdiction from the Jews.

He might be willing to use the power he had received from Rome to please them. But most certainly his *ἐξουσία* was received from them in no sense whatever. They were our Saviour's accusers; and, in accusing him as a political offender, they transferred him to a jurisdiction they could neither give nor take away.

Besides, what is the point of our Saviour's remark if it must be taken in the sense proposed? It is equally wanting in point and dignity. But if he meant to testify to a boasting tyrant and coward that no human power is irresponsible—that, in fact, all power is conferred upon man by a righteous Sovereign who will require it at his hand—that no earthly position can free a man from the obligation of doing justly, then the consistency of his character is maintained, and he stands triumphant over the tyrant's boasted irresponsibility. The accused condemns the judge—the judge feels himself the culprit on the very judgment-seat, and that justice has an unseen upholder to give it free course.

If, then, the whole condition of the case, historically considered, renders the proposed interpretation untenable, what is the logical connexion between our Saviour's declaration and inference? Pilate had received his power or jurisdiction "from above," but he did not believe he had. Faith in a God who rules in heaven and earth was no part of his creed. In fact, such a doctrine had never been taught him. It was this that rendered him less guilty than *ὁ παραδιδούς*. He thought himself responsible to no one but the Roman emperor. Nevertheless, he knew that our Saviour had been delivered into his power through malice. He found no fault in him. And yet he was ready to exercise his power without reference to what he knew to be right. This was his sin. But though he knew nothing of a righteous and holy God, by whom all power is given, Caiaphas did. "Therefore," says our Saviour, "he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." Caiaphas knew that he held his power from God and under God: to promote the ends of justice, to protect the oppressed, and deliver the innocent. But he used all his power to perpetrate the most abominable injustice. He might not know that Christ Jesus was the Lord of life and glory, but he knew that he was guiltless of the crimes laid to his charge. He knew of a bribed traitor, and suborned witnesses; and he likewise knew that the God he professed to serve had passed sentence of condemnation on all this. It is in the contrast between the knowledge of Pilate and that of Caiaphas that the force of our Saviour's inference lies. "Thou couldest have no power against me unless it were given thee from above; therefore, he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." And let it not be said that Pilate could not understand this. He was already afraid that he was doing wrong. He could not but know something of our Saviour's character and works. And he evidently had some sense of our Saviour's meaning, for "from thenceforth Pilate sought to release Him."

One word in conclusion. The writer of the article reviewed might surely understand that a man may abide by a received rendering of a passage of Scripture, in the presence of another interpretation, without

being guilty of a pious fraud. Even though one may not defend his opinions by the clearest and most irrefragable arguments, he may, nevertheless, be honest.

Rutherglen, 28th June, 1862.

J. B.

REVELATION AND SCIENCE.

IN the favourable notice which you have done me the honour to take of my recent work, *Revelation and Science*, in the last number of *J. S. L.*, there are two points to which I ask your permission to reply, not only because of their importance in themselves, but with a view to elicit the opinions of some of your numerous correspondents, on subjects which are necessarily of interest to your readers in general. The differences between my reviewer and myself may be summarily described as follows:—

1st. As to the duration of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt.

2nd. The name of the Pharaoh, in whose reign the Exode took place.

My reviewer has given seven reasons against the duration of the sojourn being limited to two hundred and fifteen years, and three reasons in favour of its being extended to four hundred and thirty years, and if those *pros* and *cons* were as perfect in argument, as they are in their numbers, I should be ready at once to own myself vanquished. Being persuaded that he will not take offence, if I say I am not yet convinced, and asking him to bear in mind the very beautiful allusion, from Plato's *Republic*, to the *idola specûs*, which he himself has adduced, I proceed to notice *seriatim* our differences. He observes, on my statement, that the sojourn of Israel in Egypt must be limited to two hundred and fifteen years.

1. "The first argument is from Gal. iii. 16, 17. Mr. Savile assumes that the four hundred and thirty years, mentioned by the apostle, dates from the call of Abram. But the text says no such thing. The promise was to Abram and his seed—the promise was repeated to Jacob two hundred and fifteen years afterwards. In the judgment of *no unbiassed mind can there remain a doubt*, that it is from the last repetition of the promise, and not from its first utterance that the four hundred and thirty years must be dated,"^v

I have referred to the following modern commentators, viz., Bishop Patrick, M. Henry, Gill, Whitby, Macknight, Scott, and Adam Clarke,—also to the eminent Scripture chronologers, who have necessarily investigated the matter in dispute in a variety of ways, viz., Clinton, Jackson and Hales; and they all, with undeviating uniformity, appear to have "no doubt" that St. Paul dates the commencement of the four hundred and thirty years, from the promise to Abraham and not from its repetition to Jacob. Were it not for fear of adducing something like a *tu quoque* argument, I should be disposed to say that nobody, unless having a

particular system to support could, by any possibility interpret Gal. iii. 16, 17, in the way my reviewer has done. If the meaning of St. Paul's words, "four hundred and thirty years after" (μετὰ), is not to be understood of the first promise originally made to "Abraham" (Gen. xii. 1—3), whom the apostle specifies by name, but may be applied indifferently to the time when it was made a *second* time to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 8), or when it was repeated to Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 3), or when it was repeated to Jacob (Gen. xviii. 14), as my reviewer understands it, there is a danger of making Scripture, what Hooker calls, "a nose of wax," by fitting it to any system which the individual interpreter may require.

2. I readily concede to my reviewer that his rendering of the important text (Exodus xii. 40), "the sojourning of the children of Israel which they sojourned," etc., agrees better with שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר of the Hebrew, or ἡ κατοίκησις . . . ἣν κατώκησαν (other MSS. read παροίκησις, etc.) of the LXX., than the translation of the Authorized Version, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, *who dwelt in Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years," but I do not see that it supports his opinion respecting the duration of the sojourn in Egypt. For the inspired author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, expressly mentions "the sojourn" of Abraham, in a way which militates against the view for which my reviewer contends—"By faith, Abraham *sojourned* in the Land of Promise, *as in a strange country*, dwelling in tabernacles *with Isaac and Jacob*, the heirs with him of the same promise" (Heb. xi. 9).

3. The question, however, remains to be considered, what is the *true* text of Exodus xii. 40? My reviewer remarks, that I have "confuted" the argument, which I have adduced, respecting the superiority of the Samaritan Pentateuch over that of the Hebrew, by having previously stated, that the *former* "abounds in various readings with respect to their different chronologies, and frequently contradict themselves, whereas the Hebrew is uniform and consistent in all its copies;"* and he condemns me for having subsequently "reversed the process," with reference to Exodus xii. 40. But he has omitted to notice, or has forgotten, that what I have really contended for, is the superiority of the Hebrew over the Samaritan and the Septuagint, in respect to *dates* and *numbers*, or in other words *general chronology*; and that, not only because we receive it as the inspired text, but because of its consistency, and its freedom from various readings. In place however of expressing my own opinion, I will adduce that of the learned Kennicott, whom many consider the first authority of modern times on this subject. He says, "It is by no means intended to recommend the adoption of the Samaritan, in place of the Hebrew Pentateuch, or so to establish the pretensions of the former, as to exclude the latter. *One* ancient copy has been received from the Jews, and we are truly thankful for it. Another ancient copy is offered by the Samaritans, let us thankfully accept that likewise. . . . If the Samaritan copy shall be found in some places to correct the Hebrew, yet will the Hebrew copy in other places correct the Samaritan. Each copy is therefore invaluable, and I am firmly persuaded,

* J. S. L., p. 485.

that the Pentateuch will never be understood perfectly, till we admit the authority of both.”^a On the text in dispute the same high authority observes, “The stone of stumbling, in this and many other instances, is evidently the notion of the integrity of the present Hebrew text, which will lead its votaries for ever into inextricable difficulties. . . . Strange! that good men should permit absurdity or contradiction to be charged upon an inspired writer, rather than allow fallibility or mistake to be imputed to a rabbinical transcriber! The following is the uniform reading of all the Samaritan MSS. in the preceding catalogue. All *here* is truly consistent and worthy the pen of Moses,—‘*Now the sojourning of the children of Israel and of their fathers, when they sojourned in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years.*’ This same sum is given by St. Paul, (Gal. iii. 17), who reckons from the promise made to Abraham (when God commanded him to go into Canaan), to the giving of the law, which soon followed the Exodus of the Israelites: and this apostolical chronology is exactly concordant with the Samaritan Pentateuch.”^b

4. My reviewer remarks that I have “dealt as satisfactorily” with the fourth argument, viz., the inspiration of the Alexandrian copy of the LXX.; and he quotes as against myself the following from *Revelation and Science*, “We accept the chronology of the Hebrew Bible as much a matter of *revelation* as any other portion of God’s word, and therefore of necessity to be preferred to the Septuagint,” p. 107. Cordially adhering to this statement, and pointing out that the argument which my reviewer seeks to draw from my words is quite beside the matter at issue between us, which is, not as to the *chronology* of the Hebrew, the Samaritan, or the Septuagint, but whether there has, or has not, been an *omission* in the text of the former, through the negligence of a transcriber, which does not occur in the latter two, my reviewer condemns me for adhering to the reading of these two, because some of the copies of both the Samaritan and the Septuagint “conform to the Hebrew reading, whereas the Hebrew itself never varies.” He has however omitted to mention what are the copies to which he alludes, and not having either Montfaucon’s great work on Origen’s *Hexapla*, or Dr. Holme’s *Vetus Testamentum Græcum* to refer to, I must content myself with the same authority I have before adduced, and quote Kennicott, who observes,—“Thus also the Greek version (Alex. and Ald. edit.) reads—‘The sojourning of the children of Israel, which they sojourned in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan, they and their fathers, was four hundred and thirty years.’” I may remark here, in respect to all passages where the Hebrew and Septuagint differ, that if they contradict each other, the present Masorite text of the former ought unquestionably to be preferred, as being the nearest approach we possess to the original holograph, but if, as in Exodus xii. 40, they do not contradict, but only *explain*, each other, we may lawfully make use of the latter in the way learned men have reverentially and laboriously done.

5. My reviewer says that my quotations from certain “*mediæval*

^a *Dissertation*, ii., pp. 164, 5. ^b *Dissertation on 1 Chron.* xi., pp. 398, 9.

Jews" in favour of this interpretation of Exodus xii. 40, have been ably answered by Wagenseil, the Buxtorfs, and their contemporaries; and he expresses his surprise at "their being appealed to as authorities," on account of what he calls "their colossal mendacity." Conceding the fact that these "*mediæval* Jews" are not very certain guides, let me ask his attention to some of the *early* Jews, and *early* Christian fathers, on the subject in dispute. Thus Demetrius, who flourished in the third century B.C., reckons 215 years from the call of Abraham to the going down into Egypt, 135 years from this last epoch to the birth of Moses, and 80 years from that to the Exode, $215 + 135 + 80 = 430$.^c Thus Josephus, who lived in the first century of the Christian era, and whose authority my reviewer will, I trust, estimate as highly as it deserves, expressly says that "the children of Israel left Egypt in the month Xanthicus, on the fifteenth day of the lunar month, 430 years after our forefather Abraham came into Canaan, *but 215 years only after Jacob removed into Egypt.*"^d

To these I add the testimonies of three Christian fathers who flourished in the fourth century. Thus Eusebius:—"Jam a primo anno Abrahami ad Mosem egressumque Judæorum ab Egypto, *consensu omnium interpretum*, anni fiunt DV. . . . Itaque a primordio ætatis Abrahami conficiuntur anni LXXV.: deinde a LXXV. anno Abrahami usque ad exitum Judæorum ab Ægypto anni sunt CCCCXXX. Profecto ei rei Paulus quoque apostolus testis accedit."^e

Thus St. Augustine in his forty-seventh question on Exodus, "In Exodo scriptum est, Incolatus filiorum Israelis, quem incoluerunt in terrâ Ægypti, et in terrâ Canaan, ipsi et patres eorum, *ami 430.*"

Thus Sulpicius Severus:—"Ab eo tempore quo Abraham in terrâ Chananæorum consedit in id quod Jacob Ægyptum ingressus est referuntur anni 215. . . . Populus egressus, ab eo quo primum Abraham terram Chananæorum accesserat anno 430."^f

I would add that the only early Christian writer whom I have discovered as giving the same interpretation as my reviewer has done to Exodus xii. 40, is Theophilus, of Antioch, in his work addressed to Autolychnus, and who lived in the second century. And the value of his testimony on chronology may be estimated by the fact, that in one place he gives 566 years for the period between the Exode and the building of the temple, and in another he computes it at 542 years.^g

6. The next objection of my reviewer is respecting "the pedigree of the Levites." I had used an argument, which with due deference to him I must still deem unanswerable, that, if 430 years had elapsed, as he contends, from the time of Jacob and his sons going down to Egypt unto the Exode, *the mother of Moses would have borne him 262 years after his father's death*, which all will agree, is impossible. My reviewer evades the force of this argument by seeking to shew, 1st., that "the pedigrees in the Bible are nearly always abridged, and terms

^c Demetr. apud Euseb., *Præp.* ix. 21., p. 425.

^d *Antiq.*, ii., xv. 2.

^e *Chron. Canon Liber. Prior.*, § 19.

^f *Hist.* i., xxi. 3, and xxvi. 4.

^g Cf. *Theoph. ad Autol.*, iii., § 22 and § 28.

of consanguinity vaguely applied in it;" 2nd., that in this particular instance it has been done, or else as "Jochebed (Moses' mother) would have been the aunt as well as the wife of Amram, and Moses and Aaron the fruits of a marriage, which, during their own lifetime and by their own mouths, the Almighty declared to be an incestuous one (Lev. xx. 19, etc.); 3rd., that the LXX. make Jochebed to be the "*first cousin*" of Amram and not the aunt; and that I ought to have accepted the reading of the LXX. in preference to the Hebrew text. To all this I reply in the words of Scripture, "And there went a man of the house of Levi, and took to wife a daughter of Levi" (Exod. ii. 1).—"Amram took him Jochebed, his father's sister to wife; and she bare him Aaron and Moses" (Exod. vi. 20).—"And the name of Amram's wife was Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, whom her mother bare to Levi in Egypt: and she bare unto Amram, Aaron and Moses, and Miriam their sister" (Numbers xxvi. 59).—"The sons of Levi; Gershon, Kohath. And the sons of Kohath; Amram, etc. And the children of Amram; Aaron and Moses, and Miriam" (1 Chron. vi. 1—3). It is impossible to find any genealogy less "vaguely" stated than the descent of Moses from Levi. But, says the reviewer, the Hebrew text then makes Amram marry his aunt, which the Levitical law forbade; therefore the reading of the LXX. which makes Amram "the daughter of his father's brother," in other words his first cousin, must be the true one. Now the reviewer has overlooked the all important distinction of *time* in his argument. When Amram married his aunt Jochebed, the Levitical law did *not* exist, and such alliances were not *then* unlawful or incestuous, as they afterwards became. Both Abraham and Jacob so far broke the Levitical law in their marriages—the one marrying his half sister (Gen. xx. 12), and the other two sisters while both were living. Either of these cases would have been deemed incestuous *after* the law was given (Lev. xx. 17, 19). Hence the LXX. translators, writing many centuries after the law had been established, understood Amram's marriage "in the revolting import it conveys to us," as the reviewer expresses it; and therefore sought to obviate the objection by the *interpolation* already noticed; but inasmuch as such interpretation is a *contradiction*, and not an *explanation*, of the Hebrew text, I feel we are bound to reject it according to the canon to which I have before referred, in estimating the respective value of different readings in the two versions. I will merely add to this the testimony of one, whom the reviewer justly esteems, and which I commend to his attention:—"Some writers," says Clinton, "have very unreasonably doubted this portion of the Hebrew chronology, as if it were uncertain how this period of 430 years was to be understood. Those who cast a doubt upon this point refuse to Moses, an inspired writer,—in the account of his mother, and father, and grandfather,—that authority, which would be given to the testimony of a profane author on the same occasion."^h

7. The last argument, which the reviewer brings against me, relates

^h *Fast. Hell*, vol. i., p. 299.

to the increase of population during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. We know from Scripture that at the time of the descent into Egypt, the number of souls amounted to 70, and at the time of the Exode had increased to "about 600,000 men, beside children," or exactly "600,550 from twenty years old and upward" (see Gen. xlv. 27; Exod. xii. 37; Numb. i. 46). This is supposed to give a population of about 2,000,000 for the descendants of Jacob when they left Egypt. Could such an increase have taken place in 215 years? Or is it necessary to assume, as the reviewer has done, that it would require the longer period of 430 years to attain to such a population? I had quoted the assertion of Dr. Baumgarten, of Kiel, that the children of Israel *might* have increased to 4,000,000 in 215 years, not so much in approval of such an induction, as in condemnation of Bunsen's usual mode of meeting Scripture statements, who had scornfully declared on this subject, "The Jewish rabbis have written nothing more absurd than Dr. Baumgarten's assertion." And I am sorry to find that my reviewer, who evidently has no leanings towards German rationalism in general, or to Bunsen in particular, should have avowed himself on Bunsen's side in this matter. Confining myself, therefore, to the numbers mentioned in Scripture, I must remind my reviewer, not only that it was natural to expect that the Israelites would have increased at such a rate as to give the numbers mentioned at the time of the Exode within 215 years, but some of the States in North America have actually increased at the same ratio in modern times. Malthus shews that the population has there *doubled itself every fifteen years*.ⁱ If we assume that the children of Israel doubled themselves every fifteen years, commencing with "seventy souls," a simple arithmetical sum would give a population of 2,293,760 at the 225th year, and consequently nearly 2,000,000 at the 215th year, when the Exode occurred. When, moreover, we remember God's promise to Abraham that he would "multiply his seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand upon the sea-shore;" and that Judah, who could not have been fifty years at the time of the descent into Egypt, had four successions in his line before that epoch; and that Benjamin, who was at the same period under thirty, had already ten sons (Gen. xlv. 21); there is not the slightest difficulty in believing the statement of Moses, and the inference to be drawn from it, that the population of the Israelites increased as it did within 215 years; and that there is no occasion for assuming that the longer period of 430 years is required for such a purpose.

Having thus replied to the seven *negative* arguments which my reviewer brings against the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt being limited to 215 years, let me notice the three *positive* arguments, which he brings forward in favour of the period being extended to 430 years.

He observes, 1. "It is unequivocally stated that it was 400 years (why not 430?) in two places,—Gen. xv. 13, and Acts vii. 6 (*J. S. L.*, p. 488). Having virtually answered this in the previous remarks, I

ⁱ Vol. i., p. 7, and vol. ii., pp. 194-5.

need do no more than remind him of his own admission, that "the rabbis at Jerusalem, who kept the Hebrew version in the fourth century B.C.,... were not trustworthy guardians of the truth.... They were enamoured of exact millenia, etc" (p. 482). As he must not ground his argument, which depends in this instance upon the correct reading of Exodus xii. 4, on those whom he considers "untrustworthy," there is additional reason for accepting the reading of the best copies of the Samaritan and LXX. versions. Moreover, as the reviewer appears to lay some stress, in support of his opinion for commencing "the 430 years" from the time of God's promise to Jacob when he entered Egypt, upon the fact that "God spake unto Israel in the visions of the night" (Gen. xlii. 2); and that Moses speaks of the time of the Exode as being "a *night* to be much observed" (Exod. xii. 42) when he considers the 430 years expired, "even on the self-same day," I would remark that, while it is certain the memorable "night" of the Exode took place on the fourteenth-fifteenth day of the moon nearest the Vernal Equinox, in other words, either at the end of March or beginning of April, and *before* the harvest could have occurred that year; on the other hand, from a close comparison of what is related in Genesis xlv. and xlii., it is probable that the descent of Jacob and his family into Egypt took place *after* the time of harvest in the second year of the seven years famine. If this argument be good it is completely subversive of the reviewer's opinion respecting the *commencement* of the 430 years.

2. The reviewer contends that as Joshua "was the *nineteenth* in direct descent from Ephraim" the grandson of Jacob, therefore it must have required a period of fully 430 years for such a number of descents; and he refers your readers to Gen. xlviii. 13—19, and 1 Chron. vii. 20—26, in confirmation of the same. In reply to this I would observe, 1st. That the pedigree given in 1 Chron vii. of Ephraim's family is so "confused," as to make it very difficult to decide what the writer really means. 2nd. That the reviewer has made a mistake in counting Joshua as *nineteenth* in descent from Ephraim when he was only *tenth*, as he has evidently counted Beriah tenth in descent, whereas it appears from ver. 23 that he was in reality his son, so that Joshua was only ten descents removed from Ephraim. 3rd. That even if the reviewer were right in his understanding of the pedigree, it does not follow but that nineteen descents could have occurred in 215 years. In those countries the age of puberty is much earlier than in our northern latitudes, and I have already noticed that there were four descents in existence of the house of Judah when he was under fifty years of age. I agree with my reviewer that the word "generation" is not necessarily restricted to one descent in every place where it is used in Scripture, but I differ from him most distinctly in his denial of there being "but forty-two descents (*i. e.*, 1260 years by the ordinary computation) between Abraham and Jesus Christ," simply because, to use his own words, the Bible "unequivocally so states them" in the first chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel. If the reviewer should have remembered that while on the one hand the age of puberty commenced

at an earlier period than with us, on the other that the duration of life was longer. Thus Abraham had a son when he was a hundred years old; Isaac when he was sixty; and Jacob when he was over ninety. Thus the average length of these (the first three of the forty-two descents from Abraham to Jesus Christ) was eighty-three years, but an average of forty-five years for each descent is sufficient to obtain the required number of years (about 1900) for that interval. We have a case in point in our own country. The difference between the eldest and youngest of the children of the late Lord Leicester, the well-known Mr. Coke of Norfolk, was nearly sixty years. This example may serve to explain how various descents or generations mentioned in Scripture work out so differently from each other.

The last argument which the reviewer brings forward is that my "interpolation" of Exodus xii. 40, according to the Samaritan and LXX. versions, is "absolute nonsense." And he pleasantly compares my mode of induction to that of "a learned pedagogue at a tea-party," who, by some mysterious process, appears to have connected "the accession of Queen Elizabeth with the landing of William the Conqueror in the year 1066!" To this I will as pleasantly reply in the language of an old pedagogue at Westminster school, when I was there some thirty years ago, "I will not say that your Latin exercise is *nonsense*, but it is not sense!" Will not my reviewer be content with the exchange of words? The latter is more euphonious, and savours less of antagonism, which I am sure is not the spirit in which the review on *Revelation and Science* is written. I apologize for the extreme length to which this letter has been necessarily extended, and reserve in consequence the *second* proposed division of my subject with your permission for another occasion.

Tattingstone Rectory,
July, 1862.

B. W. SAVILE.

THE "TE DEUM."

I HAVE no intention of replying to any of the strictures made by your correspondent A. H. W., in the present number of the *J. S. L.*, on my defence of the "acknowledged" interpretation of the terms "Everlasting Father" in the "Te Deum," being convinced that my doing so would be perfectly useless, as I should simply be again informed that I "had left the most important part of the matter entirely unnoticed." However, I may console myself that the author of the article on the "same subject" in "the same number" must necessarily, though writing editorially, be involved in the "same judgment," since it is in perfect harmony with all which I had previously said.

But even without the slightest reference to *external* evidence, it must be plain to any ordinary understanding, not under the influence of some "strange hallucination," that no possible stretch of theological bias can induce a belief in the theory proposed by your correspondent and his friend Lamed. Assuming that by the everlasting Father in

the second verse we are "tacitly" to understand that the Lord Jesus is "intended," though "not expressed," are we to believe that in the eleventh and twelfth verses the words, "The Father of an infinite Majesty," relate to the same Person in the Holy Trinity as He who is denominated, "Thine honourable, true, and only Son?" I suppose, though they are careful not to say so, that the absurdity of such a supposition must have struck your correspondent and his friend, and they get over the difficulty by trying to persuade themselves and others that these verses are spurious, and interpolated. To this I may reply in the words of the article above mentioned, "that no trace of such an interpolation as is referred to can be found in extant copies." But omitting even this, there comes the significant fact, that the verse which even your correspondent would admit to be genuine, as well as the nine preceding, are *incomplete* as to *sense*, without those which follow. Thus,

"The holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee,
The Father of an infinite Majesty."

Or as in the Latin,

"Te per orbem terrarum sancta confitetur Ecclesia,
Patrem immensæ Majestatis."

To stop at the first line, besides being ungrammatical, would be to omit the attribute of paternity which the universal church confesses throughout the world.

Your correspondent says, "I had hoped that my letter would have drawn forth a number of ancient Greek hymns and other things bearing on this subject, instead of which we have merely a lecture on the appellation, 'Everlasting Father.'" Whether any impression would have been produced upon his mind by the exhibition of the hymns in question is rather problematical, for if we may judge from the specimens produced in the article on the "Te Deum," their testimony would have gone directly "against" his proposed theory. That my communication is "merely a lecture" on the appellation "Everlasting Father," implies I imagine, that it is diffuse and unsatisfactory. I have no doubt that it is so to "him;" that it is so to "others," my conviction will hardly induce me to believe.

In conclusion I can only hope that by a fortunate accident some theologian may arise who may succeed in dispelling the illusion which at present has taken such complete possession of your correspondent's mind. He may esteem it a "virtuous singularity," but will hardly make converts to a theory so opposed to the "universal" belief of the universal Church.

July 11th, 1826.

H. P.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

IN a critique upon the work of a noted disbeliever in the inspiration of the Old Testament, you remark in your well digested summary of his opinions, "In all this the author has not exceeded the limits and

liberties of criticism" (p. 474). Will you allow me to join issue with you on this momentous question? In my judgment (poor and valueless as it may be), he and his logical congeners very far exceed every imaginable limit of true Biblical criticism, not only in the places you indicate, but in the whole tenor of their strictures upon the Sacred Volume. To make this appear we must raise the original question, how is the Bible to be received, as the word of man or of God? If the former alternative be the true one, then is your author quite right, so is Archdeacon Williams and so also are the rest of the essayists and reviewers. The demand, moreover, of one of them that the Bible should be treated "just as any other book," is perfectly reasonable. But grant that the Bible is what it declares itself to be, and therefore so to be received "as the word, not of man, but as it is in truth the word of God," how then? In this case the criticisms of the parties before us are altogether illogical, and can result in nothing but perplexity and confusion. To prove this I cite one fact only at the threshold of the enquiry, passing by many others in the same position. By our hypothesis the author of the Bible never dies. Moses died on Mount Nebo, but God did not. It was, therefore perfectly competent for him (as for any other author) to record in the text of his own work, the death of the man whose idiosyncrasy he had employed in its first transcription; nor is it a matter for surprise, that God should make the subsequent transcriptions of his work recensions also, like any other author. The ethical purpose of the original revelation, moreover, would assuredly not be forgotten in these recensions. Whatever would make the sacred text available for the instruction of the generation for whom the transcription was designed, would, undoubtedly, be added thereto; hence the glosses, scholia, and comments, in every shape, which are incorporated in the present text of the books of Moses, and the other earlier portions of the Old Testament.

As to the time when this divine superintendence ceased, in the opinion of the early Church, it was withdrawn at the Babylonish captivity, during which the system so well known to most of your readers as the *Kri* and *Chetibh*, was invented by the Jews. At Babylon also, in all probability, was first founded the order of the *Scribes*, men who were educated for the express purpose of transcribing the sacred text, with absolutely literal exactness, from some reputedly divine original, in the possession of the Jewish nationality. I need not remind your readers that their apparatus for this purpose still exists, and that it extends, not only to the numbers of the words, but also to that of the letters (distinguishing each throughout the alphabet) in every book of the Old Testament. According to one of the early fathers (Irenæus, *ni fallor*), the *authenticæ litteræ* of this vast apparatus, were divinely communicated to Ezra, after the return from Babylon. This circumstance at any rate may serve to shew that the early Church saw and contended for the divine superintendence over the books of the Old Testament, which I am endeavouring to advocate.

I have only to say in conclusion, that no man living has contended more earnestly than myself against that mistaken, but well in-

tioned school of Biblical critics, which is resolved to make the Bible true *per fas et nefas*! But are there not just now strong symptoms of the same fanaticism at the opposite pole of the controversy? Not among the honest though foul-mouthed and strong-lunged asserters that the Bible is a lie altogether; but in that *couleur de rose* tint of infidelity, which in the establishment takes the form of *Essays and Reviews*, and among dissenters crops out, as the "Commentary," which, for many reasons, you so justly praise.

Grimstone, July, 1862.

M. N.

[We print the foregoing remarks upon our review of Dr. Davidson's book, although we do not think any of our readers will suspect the reviewer of any sympathy with views which he really condemns. This would be unjust. The letter of M. N. is inserted, not because it animadverts upon one of our reviewers, who are usually infallible, but because it represents the views entertained about the limits and laws of criticism by many. We do not think our correspondent either gives liberty enough, or quite correctly describes Dr. Davidson. Ed. J. S. L.]

THE LAST SUPPER NOT A PASSOVER.

It was never my intention to follow Mr. Constable through all the Old Testament texts which he has cited. In that respect I have left his theory in the hands of Mr. Franke Parker, who is, if I mistake not, fully equal to the task. For my own part I have simply entered upon the question of the "two evenings," with respect to which it is pretty well known that the only passage that presents any difficulty to the traditional explanation is Deut. xvi. 6. There the expression is not בֵּין הָעָרֶב , as Mr. Constable cites it, but בֵּין הָעָרֶב , and surely the indefinite infinitive, especially when joined to the indefinite בֵּין , may represent the secondary or imperfect tense בֵּין , quite as well as the past tense בֵּין , and may correspond to the Greek $\epsilon\pi\iota\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ quite as well as to $\epsilon\pi\iota\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$. And it is quite clear that the LXX. understood it so, though Mr. F. Parker in p. 419 of your last number has not made the most of his argument from Josh. viii. 29, which he should have translated "and as soon as the sun *was setting*, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcase down." The next quotation from Deut. xxi. 23, shews that the burial must take place on the day of execution, *i.e.*, before sunset.

It is singular that in Mark i. 32 we find $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$, and in the parallel passage in Luke iv. 40, $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ used of the same time. Probably there was some peculiar mode of dating sunset among the Jews of the day with which we are no longer acquainted.

I cannot understand how Mr. Constable can say, that "according to Mr. Wratislaw's own shewing, the phrase *between the evenings* includes the close of one day and the beginning of the next. It is quite possible, therefore, as far as this phrase is concerned, that the evening sacrifice might have been offered up before sunset, *since both periods were between the evenings*." On referring to my letter in J. S. L., January, 1862, I find that I had been diligently endeavouring

to shew that the first evening dated from half-way between noon and sunset, and the second from sunset. The space therefore between the two must end at sunset. I must beg Mr. Constable to take another look at my diagram before he finally charges me with cutting the ground from under my own feet in so absurd a manner.

I suppose I must endeavour to shew Mr. Constable that his very brief and off-hand treatment of John xiii. 29 is unsatisfactory. When we use such an expression as "*the* feast," we usually mean the great feast of the time. But according to Mr. Constable the grand ceremony of the passover was over, and thus the expression "*the* feast" would have been used of a less immediately after a greater. Besides it is unlikely that the shops should have been open immediately after the passover if it had been a Jewish passover, or that our Lord and his disciples should have taken advantage of the shops being open owing to a calculation of the proper time of the Paschal sacrifice different from their own. They would thus have been doing what the rest of their countrymen might not have done at the corresponding period of the feast.

With regard to the evangelists, Mr. Constable proceeds to beg the question entirely. I deny that "three of the evangelists tell us, that our Lord and his apostles ate what they considered and called the passover." They state that the passover was prepared, whatever the meaning of those words may be, and that our Lord and his disciples then ate a meal, which they do *not* call, although Mr. Constable considers it the passover. It is true that commentators have been in the habit of calling it the passover, but the question at issue between us is, whether or no the evangelists really considered it to be so. And in the last number of this Journal, I have brought forward proofs that those of the fathers, who lived nearest to the time, and were in other respects most capable of judging, did not understand the synoptic Gospels in this respect as Mr. Constable does. St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 23—26, describes the institution of the Lord's Supper most fully and carefully, without the slightest hint that he considered it instituted in connexion with the passover.

Our Lord did *not*, as far as I can see, authorize his disciples to violate the tradition of the elders relative to the washing of hands, but simply took occasion from the remarks made by the Pharisees on their negligence to administer a most severe rebuke to the hypocrisy of those who put such traditions above the moral law.

If Mr. Constable will refer to the parallel passage in Lev. xxiii., he will find that Dean Ellicott has not spoken so thoughtlessly as he supposes, and that there is considerable probability that the first holy convocation was on the 15th. According to Mr. Constable's reckoning of the two evenings a day's difference is made, but according to the common reckoning a certain amount of probability is due to Dean Ellicott's observation, only the latter part of the 14th being comprised in the festival of unleavened bread.

Mr. Constable is very anxious, in several instances, to throw the *onus probandi* on others, when it clearly rests upon himself. If Josephus

and Philo (who professes to give an account of the various sects of the Jews), notice no division among the Jews as to the proper time of killing the passover, the probability is that there was no such division, and the *onus probandi* lies on Mr. Constable to shew that there was one, not on Mr. Blenkinsopp or any one else to shew that there was not. And the testimony of the Mishna comes in fairly enough in support of the strong negative evidence afforded by the silence of Josephus and Philo while discussing the subject. And the testimony of the Karaites and Samaritans is inferior still to that of the Mishna. Allowing them to pair off with the Mishna, Mr. Constable has positively no evidence to bring forward on this point but his own conjecture.

Mr. Blenkinsopp will find an argument in favour of his view, that our Lord celebrated the Eucharist with leavened bread, in the bottom of page 455 in the last number of this Journal. I was not previously aware that the question, whether the word *ἄρτος* is applicable or not to the *ἄζυμα* used at the passover, was raised so long ago.

I am sorry that Mr. Constable should have been thus premature in raising his triumphal cry.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

CHRONOLOGY OF OUR LORD'S LAST PASSOVER.

MR. PARKER has in your Journal of July, 1862, entered very fully upon the above question with the view of overthrowing the theory I have advanced. I do not think he has succeeded, and will give my reasons for thinking so.

The "great question" does not appear to me to be, "did our Lord keep the passover at his last supper?" There is to my mind no question here, for three evangelists have declared that he did. The real question is, how far are they correct in their statement, and how is it to be reconciled with that of St. John. I confess I am always surprised when any one says, after reading the statements of the synoptic gospels, that he is in any doubt as to whether they intended to convey the impression that our Lord really partook of the passover. Let us attend to their statements for a moment.

From St. Luke's account and that of Matthew and Mark we gather these facts. Our Lord on the day when the passover must be killed, *i. e.*, on the fourteenth day of the month, commanded two of his disciples to make the passover ready, and declared his intention of partaking of that passover with them (Luke xxii. 7.) He then, in answer to their inquiry, tells them the place where he intended to eat the passover, and directed them to inform the owner of the house of his intention of there eating the passover with his disciples (Luke xxii. 9—11, and Matt. xxvii. 18). The disciples carried out all the directions of their master, and made every preparation requisite for eating the passover, *i. e.*, they had the lamb killed and dressed (Matt. xxvii. 19; Luke xxii. 13). After the preparations of the passover are all completed

they only wait for the hour of eating it, and “when *the hour* was come, he sat down with the twelve” (Luke xxii. 14). What is meant by “*the hour*” here? Can it have any other meaning than the hour of partaking of the passover, which alone they had been preparing for and speaking of? And, as if this is not enough, we are told that the meal to which they then sat down was that very passover which they had been preparing, and looking forward to (Luke xxii. 15). There is the statement of the synoptic gospels, and this statement leaves us in no doubt as to whether they intended to tell us that our Lord partook of the passover at his last supper.

I should prefer any theory to this. I should prefer to abandon the inspiration of the gospels altogether, and take them as the accounts of ordinary witnesses liable to error, and sometimes falling into error, rather than accept a theory which professes to honour them as inspired writings, and then represents them as speaking—even when they seem to speak the plainest—in language of the most perplexed and unintelligible kind. Whatever we are led to, let us avoid this. Three evangelists give a plain account of our Lord’s partaking of the passover. Let us not try to make them out as saying anything else. Let us take the case as it stands, and see what we can make of it. The fourth gospel gives a statement apparently at variance with theirs. Let us try if they can be fairly reconciled, or, if we cannot reconcile them, let us honestly say so.

I have put forward a theory which, if it can be established, reconciles the statements of the synoptic gospels with that of John.^j Various objections have been made to it. Some of these objections I have allowed, but I think I have shewn that they leave the main question untouched. I confess I have nowhere seen any attempt to take up my arguments as they stand, and refute them. I do not deny that Mr. Parker has brought forward in his last letter what is worthy of consideration; and I will now proceed to consider what he says. One observation, however, I would first make. It is this: Mr. Parker does not reason from the Hebrew original, but from the Septuagint translation. He can never succeed in a question of this kind in this way. The Septuagint is no more decisive of the real meaning of a passage in the Old Testament than our Authorized Version is of a passage in the New.

Mr. Parker evidently relies very much, in opposition to my theory, on the view, admitted fully by me, that the killing of the Paschal lamb was typical of the sacrifice of the Lord on the cross. His argument is that as our Lord was undoubtedly put to death at the close of the fourteenth day, so the typical Paschal lamb must have been originally commanded to be slain *at the very same hour*, for that otherwise it would not be typical. In the beginning of his last letter he indeed seems not to insist absolutely on this; but in the end of it he returns to it, and seems to put it forward as quite conclusive.

When Mr. Parker shews us from Scripture *that a type, in order to*

^j *J. S. L.*, October, 1861, p. 50.

be a type, must correspond in every particular with the antitype, this will be with me a valid objection to my view. Till he does it is no objection at all. *I do not believe that any type thus corresponds*, any more than a parable corresponds in every minute particular with the spiritual truth it was meant to teach. The Paschal lamb is not the only type of Christ. Will Mr. Parker shew us any other which corresponds in the way in which he insists the Paschal lamb must?

I could just as easily in this way prove that our Lord must have partaken of the passover at his last supper, as Mr. Parker proves by it that he could not. There seems to be no doubt that the Eucharist in the Christian Church has taken the place of the passover in the Jewish. (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). I have surely the same right to say that the Eucharist thus substituted for the passover must have been instituted at the very time the passover was partaken of, as Mr. Parker has to say that Christ must have been offered up at the very hour when God ordained the Paschal lamb to be slain. I do not rely at all upon an argument of this kind, but it certainly neutralizes that of Mr. Parker.

In endeavouring to overturn my reasoning, that the time "between the evenings" means, *in the case of the Paschal lamb*, the time subsequent to sunset, Mr. Parker makes a very extraordinary assertion. He evidently allows that the expression signifies the time from the decline of the sun to the departure of twilight, and yet he says that "no time after the beginning of the second evening could be said to be between the two evenings" (p. 418). The time from sunset to the departure of twilight is just half the concluding half, of the entire time; and is just as much between the evenings as the first or opening half is between them. That which includes the whole cannot be said to exclude a part of the whole; yet this is what Mr. Parker asserts.

Mr. Parker's effort to sustain this assertion does not help him in the least. He says the time indicated by the expression, "between the evenings" for the killing of the lamb, "must be wholly in one Jewish day, and not partly in one day and partly in another." To this I quite agree, but it leaves the question quite untouched as to whether it refers to the opening or the closing part of the fourteenth day. I maintain it refers to the former. It is in itself an uncertain phrase, the exact application of which must be determined by other considerations.

Further on Mr. Parker refers to Deut. xvi. 6 as bearing upon this question. It does indeed bear upon it very strongly, and, in my opinion, very conclusively for me. I will take the liberty to refer Mr. Parker to my argument from it in the *J. S. L.* (October, 1861, p. 57), where I maintain that according to Hebrew usage the particle *ו*, joined to an infinitive of action or motion, indicates the action or motion *as past*, and that consequently the command in this place is to sacrifice the passover *when the sun was set*. Let Mr. Parker try this. He has not done so as yet. As to his distinction of the two phrases, "at even" and "at the going down of the sun," as referring the one to the first evening and the other to the second, this will not stand. The phrases evidently refer to the same time.

Mr. Parker relies a good deal upon the fact (not denied by me) that

the *daily sacrifice*, commanded to be slain "between the evenings," was slain, and with propriety, *before* sunset and at the close of the day. This is no proof that the Paschal lamb must have been slain before sunset, since, as we have seen, the phrase includes the time before and subsequent to sunset. I have, indeed, from this tried to account for the change of the time of killing the passover. I would invite Mr. Parker to consider what I have said in *J. S. L.*, April, 1862, p. 179.

Mr. Parker tries to fortify his view of Deut. xvi. 6, which the Septuagint translates by *πρὸς δυσμὰς ἡλίου*, by shewing that, in Joshua x. 27, *πρὸς ἡλίου δυσμὰς* means before sunset. I do not deny it, but it is nothing to the question. I deny that *πρὸς δυσμὰς ἡλίου* is a proper translation in Deut. xvi. 6, though it is a proper translation in Joshua x. 27. If Mr. Parker will examine the Hebrew he will find the expressions different.

In Joshua viii. 29 he has, indeed, a passage which has a considerable appearance of favouring his view of Deut. xvi. 6: at least of shewing that the Hebrew particle *א*, joined to an infinitive of motion, *may sometimes* point to what is to come, not to what is past. If Mr. Parker had here brought forward the Hebrew it would have made his case appear stronger, for the phrases in the Hebrew are identical. We must then examine this passage in Joshua viii. 29. Our Authorized Version translates thus, "*as soon as the sun was down* Joshua commanded that they should take his carcase down from the tree," and the Hebrew is *כִּשְׁלֹחַ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ*. Here Mr. Parker reasons, and with much force, that the phrase must mean *before the going down of the sun*, because the command of the Jewish law was that the criminals hung upon trees should be taken down before sunset (Deut. xxi. 23). From this precept, and from Jewish practice (Joshua x. 27), there is much force in this argument. But I contend for all that, that our translation is here right, and that in this instance Joshua did leave a man hanging until after sunset. Had I no other ground I would go fearlessly upon the proper force of the Hebrew phrase itself. Is it certain that a precept was always observed—that there might be no exceptional cases? Is it certain that what was usually done was always done? Certainly not. And I maintain that in Joshua viii. 29 we have a case where the precept of Deut. xxi. 23 was departed from. Let us see if we have not enough to shew us that there were cases where this precept was not acted on. In John xix. 31, to which Mr. Parker refers, we read, "The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day (for that sabbath day was an high day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away." Here no doubt we read that the Jews were so unwilling that the bodies should remain after sunset on the cross, that they hastened the death of the malefactors. But are we not told this in such a way as plainly intimates that it was the *peculiar sacredness of the approaching sabbath* that made them act thus, and that if the next day had not been a sabbath, and a particularly sacred sabbath too, they would have permitted them to remain hanging until after sunset? I do not say they would have done this without a reason: but they had a

reason. *The malefactors were not dead*, and they would have let them hang till they were dead, if the approaching day were any common day of the week. A reason of this very kind, or of some kind judged sufficient, may have existed in the case of the king of Ai (Joshua viii. 29), and therefore we have no warrant to depart in this case from the proper force of the Hebrew, because it indicates a departure from a precept and a practice which were not universally followed.

There is another passage (Deut. xxiv. 13) referred to by Mr. Parker, where the particle *ו* is joined to the infinitive, and where he thinks that the time before sunset is indicated. I still am convinced that it must mean when the sun had set, and that the context points out this as its sense. In the preceding verse the creditor is told that he must not "*sleep*" with the debtor's pledge. Hence we see that the object of the command is to deliver back the pledge in sufficient time to enable the poor debtor to use his pledge as his covering by night, which would be done by restoring it during the twilight subsequent to sunset. The hire of the poor man (ver. 15) was to be paid before sunset that he might have time to expend it on his evening's meal, but there is no analogy between this and the pledge.

Mr. Parker next proceeds to shew that Israel marched out of Egypt within some half-hour or hour subsequent to the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, and that as their march was undoubtedly on the fifteenth of the month, the first Paschal lamb must have been slain at the close of the fourteenth day, and eaten in the opening of the fifteenth day. I would refer Mr. Parker to my argument in *J. S. L.*, October, 1861, p. 53, in which I think I have established that this was not the case. I will now shew that Mr. Parker's reasons for his opinion do not bear him out. In the first place, Exod. xii. 22 shews us, beyond any question, that Israel did not march during the hours of the night, as Mr. Parker imagines, for they are there commanded not to go out of the doors of their houses *until the morning*. They consequently did not march that night. Again: Deut. xvi. 6 tells us that the time of their first march was *evening*, and not night. And what are Mr. Parker's reasons for controverting this plain narrative. His first reason is that Pharaoh "called for Moses and Aaron by night, and said, Rise up, and get you forth from amongst my people, both you and the children of Israel," etc. (ver. 31.) We are told here that Moses and Aaron were sent for by night, and told to take the Israelites as quickly as possible out of the land; but this does not prove that they actually marched that very moment, which would be indeed a physical impossibility. To suppose a whole nation, however long warned that they would have to leave a country soon, to march at an hour's notice is absurd. A disciplined army could not do it: much less a multitude of men of every age, women, children, and cattle, with all their household goods. It is a marvel of haste and arrangement that they should be able to march on the following evening. But Mr. Parker says that the fact of the people taking their dough *before it was leavened*, is a proof that they must have marched at once, and not made a delay of many hours. But we are told (ver. 34) that the reason they took the dough unleavened

was, not that it had not time to be leavened, but that their “kneading troughs were bound up,” and could not be used. As soon as the command to depart was given, they began to pack up their household utensils; and this, and not an actual want of time, was the reason. They had, between the order to depart and the actual march, time to borrow the precious things of Egypt (ver. 35). Mr. Parker also says in proof of his view, that the Egyptians had strength to expel Israel, and that the latter were in fear of the Egyptians, and that consequently they marched the moment they were told. I think he will see on a more careful consideration of the chapter, that *at the time spoken of* it was the Egyptians who were in mortal fear of Israel, not *vice versa*, and that they would have dreaded making use of any violence. So much afraid were they that they gave them whatever they chose to ask for (ver. 33—35). As to the urgency with which their march was pressed (ver. 33), this is fully answered by the march within the next twenty-four hours. Let Mr. Parker examine any similiar event—the march of an eastern army with its multitude of attendants, or the exodus of an entire people—and see if marvellous haste must not indeed have been made to enable Israel to leave Egypt when I have supposed it did. It was not until Israel had left Egypt that Egypt recovered from its consternation, and dared to meditate further violence (Exod. xiv. 10).

In following out his view here, Mr. Parker falls into a mistake about the feast of the passover, into which I myself fell in the first edition of my essay on the chronology of our Lord’s last passover, and from the same reason, namely, from adopting the account of Josephus instead of adhering to the account of Scripture. Josephus seems to suppose that the feast of the passover, and the feast of unleavened bread, were originally two distinct feasts; the first lasting one day, the second lasting seven days; and that from following immediately the one upon the other, they came to be looked on as one feast of eight days. Scripture however shews it to be erroneous. It all through identifies the passover and the feast of unleavened bread as one and the same feast, lasting seven days. The passover was a feast of seven days in which unleavened bread was used (Exod. xii. 14, 15; Numb. xxviii. 17; Dent. xvi. 2, 3). The following table will shew the seven days.

TABLE OF THE FEAST OF THE PASSOVER.

Nisan.		Day.
Fourteenth day.	From its first sunset to its second sunset, 24 hours,=	First.
Fifteenth	”	Second.
Sixteenth	”	Third.
Seventeenth	”	Fourth.
Eighteenth	”	Fifth.
Nineteenth	”	Sixth.
Twentieth	”	Seventh.

Here, at the close of the twentieth day of the month, or until the twenty-first day at its first even (Exod. xii. 18), is the period of seven days during which the passover lasted. It embraced no part of the twenty-first day of the month. It was strictly a feast of seven days. But how did Josephus get eight days? By the change which I have

charged the Jews with making in the passover. Here is the table of the feast according to Josephus.

Nisan.		Day.
Fourteenth day.	The latter part of this fourteenth day to its second sunset, =	First.
Fifteenth	From its first sunset to its second sunset, 24 hours,	Second.
Sixteenth	"	Third.
Seventeenth	"	Fourth.
Eighteenth	"	Fifth.
Nineteenth	"	Sixth.
Twentieth	"	Seventh.
Twenty-first,	opening part of the day until midnight,	Eighth.

This table, including the whole or portions of *eight* days, is opposed to the scriptural account of the feast as a feast of *seven days*; but it naturally followed from the altered Jewish custom of killing the lamb at the close of the fourteenth day, and not at its beginning.

In p. 423, Mr. Parker brings forward the statement of St. John in opposition to my view. Now John says not a word as to whether the Lord did or did not eat the passover. He doubtless had seen the synoptic gospels, but he leaves their statements unexplained and uncontradicted. He tells us apparently that the Jews had not partaken of their passover at a time when, according to the synoptic gospels, our Lord's passover had been for some time eaten. This is the difficulty to be solved. Mr. Parker sets John in opposition to the earlier gospels: I endeavour to reconcile them without explaining away the statement of either.

At p. 424, Mr. Parker endeavours to shew that the synoptic gospels speak in a manner that shews their agreement with the view that our Lord had not partaken of the passover on the evening preceding the crucifixion. He does this by stating that the *four* Evangelists agree in calling the day of the crucifixion *the day of the preparation*. Now even supposing that the synoptic gospels called this fourteenth day of Nisan the day of the preparation of the passover, there is nothing at all inconsistent with my view; according to which the fourteenth day was the preparation of the passover. Both views make the passover to be prepared on that day. But it so happens that while St. John calls the time of our Lord's trial and crucifixion *the preparation of the passover*, the other Evangelists speak of it *as the preparation of the Sabbath*. Mark (xv. 42) says, "When the even was come, because it was *the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath*:" and Luke says, "That day was the preparation; *and the Sabbath drew on*." Matthew (xxvii. 62) probably speaks of it with the same reference, but he does not mention either passover or Sabbath. So that Mr. Parker has not even the grounds he seems to think he has from this identity of phrase; for while both speak of the day of the preparation, the synoptic gospels speak of the preparation of the *Sabbath*, and John of the preparation of *the passover*.

My position is then as yet untouched. Notwithstanding the opinions of some few of the fathers, and of some few modern critics, the question is, The synoptic gospels say that our Lord partook of the

passover the evening before his crucifixion, and St. John says that on the day of the crucifixion the Jews had not partaken of theirs. How are these views to be reconciled?^k

H. C.

THE SCRIPTURE COSMOGONY.

I beg the favour of publication in your Journal of the following remarks, which I have been induced to make in consequence of reading the essay of the Rev. G. Rorison, entitled "The Creative Week," in the volume of replies to *Essays and Reviews*, published by J. H. and J. Parker. It is far from being my intention to write a critique on that essay,—all that I propose to say has reference either to the brief allusion there made to my work on *The Plan and Progress of Creation*, or to the bearing which certain other passages have on the leading idea of that work. After mentioning several other theories of the Scripture cosmogony, the author says (p. 330) respecting mine, "One gentleman considers it an account of plan as distinguished from fulfilment;" and then adds, "We venture to think none of these descriptions satisfactory. The Book of Genesis opens with the inspired psalm of creation." I might, on my part, venture to think that the word "psalm" is not properly descriptive of the first chapter of Genesis. But a mere expression of opinion respecting any proposed theory amounts to very little, unless it be supported by some argument. The only argument Mr. Rorison has vouchsafed to adduce in opposition to the principle of my explanation is thus stated: "Nor will many believe that creation *as an idea* is the thing intended, so long as the plainest of plain language assures them that the thing intended is creation *as a fact*." The language, I admit, is plain enough; but there is no direct assurance that the thing intended is creation as a fact. On the contrary, there is a plain statement which fully justifies the inference that creation as a fact is not intended. I allude to Gen. ii. 5, in which it is said that "the Lord God made every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew." It is evident that the narrative expression, "God made," is here applied to that which, humanly speaking, was not actually existing. For a plant of the field which is not in the earth, and a herb of the field which does not grow, are not objective entities. They exist only as conceived in the mind of the Creator, antecedently to, and apart from, their being made cognizable to human sense. This passage, consequently, can only be taken as an assertion of the antecedent conception of a design,—of plan before execution. It is the prerogative of deity to speak of that as done which he purposes to do. Isaiah xxxvii. 26 furnishes an illustrative instance: "Hast thou not heard how long ago I have done it; of ancient times that I have formed it? now have I brought it to pass." This language, it

^k We must now conclude this discussion unless something that is new can be brought forward.—Ed.

is well known, is constantly held in the prophetic Scriptures. I take this opportunity of stating that the above interpretation of Gen. ii. 5, which is also given in p. 55 of my essay on Gen. i., occurs in No. I. of the *Tracts for Priests and People* (p. 30); and that I had no knowledge of this circumstance till my attention was drawn to it by a notice in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* (No. XXVII., p. 211). I mention this the rather because in the midst of an endless diversity of opinions respecting the scriptural account of the creation, a coincidence of thought from independent sources on any one point gives some hope of ultimate unanimity, and affords some degree of presumption that on that point at least the truth has been reached.

It would be going against common experience and common sense to say that there can be any rational work, great or small, which is not executed for a purpose, and according to a plan. Whatever is rightly called work is such, and whatever is not such is not work. Hence the creation, being rightly called a work, was antecedently planned. What wonder, then, if we find the plan marked out in the Word of God? The author of "The Creative Week" does not deny that there was a plan; for in p. 296 he speaks of the universe as being "the work of one God; the projection of his thought, the transcript of his plan;" and in p. 309 of "progress in a creative plan." But with some degree of inconsistency he is unwilling to admit the evidence drawn from Gen. ii. 5, that the statements in Gen. i. are descriptive of the plan. What then, I ask, does that passage refer to? Surely to nothing that follows, there being nothing said subsequently about the creation of plants and herbs, to which the assertions in verse 5 will in the least degree apply. I have shewn in my essay (p. 56) by arguments which, I think, no Greek scholar would call in question, that in the Septuagint, verses 4 and 5 of chap. ii., refer to the preceding account of the creation. It will probably be objected that this inference has not been drawn by modern Hebraists from the Hebrew text, and that it is not indicated by the Authorized Version. To which it may be replied, that the seventy interpreters deduced their view of the passage from the Hebrew; and the decision of the question consequently turns on the comparative credit to be given to the Septuagintal and the modern interpretations. I do not hesitate to say that I give the preference here to the Septuagint, on the ground that it is hardly possible that any modern Hebraist can be in as favourable a position as were the LXX. for knowing in particular instances the exact force of transition particles, susceptible, it may be, of various senses and different applications. At the beginning of ver. 6 of chap. ii. they have employed a transition particle, which indicates that verses 4 and 5 close the preceding account of the cosmogony; and we are not entitled in these days to assert that this was done in ignorance of the genius and idiom of the Hebrew language.

But apart from grammatical considerations it may be urged that Heb. iv. 3, "Although the works were finished from the foundation of the world," expresses in different words all the meaning that is attributed above to Gen. ii. 5. The same idea, as I have shewn in my essay (p. 110), is contained in that early Christian writing, the Epistle

of Barnabas. And again, the following passage occurs in the writings of Augustine (*De Genesi cont. Manich.*, ii. 1), which is so remarkable that I give the original as well as a translation, lest, if I gave only a translation, the exact import of it might not be seen: "Post enumerationem et expletionem dierum septem, interposita est quasi quædam conclusio, et appellatus est liber creaturæ cœli et terræ quicquid superius dictum est, cum sit parva pars libri. Sed ideo sic meruit vocari, quia universi seculi a capite ad finem quasi brevis quædam imago in his diebus septem figurata est." Translation:—"After the enumeration and completion of the seven days, there is interposed, as it were, a certain conclusion, and all that was said antecedently is called the book of the creation of heaven and earth, although it is a small part of a book. But it deserved to be so called for the reason that a certain brief representation, as it were, of the whole age [all time?] from the beginning to the end is figured in these seven days." On this passage it may be remarked, first, that the words "conclusio," and "quicquid superius dictum est," prove that Augustine took Gen. ii. 4 and 5 to be a conclusion interposed between the first and second accounts, and referring exclusively to the first. As, however, he relied on the Septuagint, I refer to this part of the passage only as being confirmatory of the deductions above drawn from that version on philological grounds. With respect to the latter part I may be permitted to say that it expresses as distinctly as possible the view I have laboured to establish in the chapter on the seventh day in my essay on Gen. i., and that at the time I was wholly unacquainted with this passage in Augustine's works. In fact, my attention was first directed to it by its being quoted by Mr. Rorison (Essay, p. 281), who, however, has not thought it worth while to quote farther than the word "creaturæ," substituting for the remainder an *et cætera*.

The importance of the question above discussed will be apparent from the consideration that if, as maintained, Gen. ii. 4 and 5 expresses the *principle* on which the account of the creation is given, all argumentation respecting the account must proceed on an acknowledgment of that principle. Whatever disbelief an opponent may entertain respecting the Scripture cosmogony, he is not entitled to regard it as anything different from what Scripture itself states it to be. Mr. Goodwin, without having paid attention, as it seems, to the exact meaning of Gen. ii. 4 and 5, has in his Essay (p. 217) gratuitously cut off this passage from consideration, and has consequently taken the cosmogony to be something different from what it professes to be. Thus, however well he may have reasoned on his own grounds, his reasoning has no application. This is the true and the only reply to Mr. Goodwin's Essay. Mr. Rorison, by missing this argument, has not given a reply.

For the same reason the Essay V. in the *Aids to Faith*, whatever merits it may possess in other respects, is not an answer to Mr. Goodwin's argument, inasmuch as it passes over in silence verse 5 of chap. ii., and contains no recognition of the important principle which that verse conveys. There must be fault somewhere in reasoning which

refuses to take account of *all* the passages of Scripture bearing on the question. I take this occasion also to say that the copula "and," by which, as the author of that essay states, verse 1 and 2 of chapter i. are connected, is not supported by the Septuagint. The transition particle δὲ there used stands directly opposed to the relation between those verses contended for in the essay. For the reasons before adduced, I feel compelled here also to accept the authority of the Septuagint, not being able to admit that there are any grounds on which superior authority on such a point can be established.

If, as I have argued, it be a just and necessary inference from chap. ii. 4 and 5, that the scriptural account of the creation is not historic, but proleptical, a ready answer may be given to all objections founded on supposed contradictions between that account and the deductions of natural science. Scripture gives a scheme, of which nature exhibits the unfolding; and as the geologist cannot assert that he is able to read with perfect certainty all the natural records of the past history of the earth, so neither ought it to be expected of the theologian to read with certainty the account of the antecedent scheme of a work so vast and multiform. Contradictions between one record and the other may well be believed to be only apparent, and to admit of explanation by more complete knowledge of both. There is on the face of the scriptural record an entire disregard of anticipations that might be formed from the observation of the commonest facts. Who, for instance, would expect to find in a cosmogony the creation of light, and the alternation of day and night, before the creation of the sun? This very contradiction to obvious facts, while it is evidence that the account emanated from no human cosmogonist, at the same time demands an enquiry into the principles on which it was written. Although the terms employed are of the plainest kind, the principles which regulate the order and character of the statements are by no means obvious. And yet, as I fully believe, they admit of being discovered, and that too by means of the very deductions from natural science by which the statements have been thought to be contradicted. This is what I have attempted to do in the work already referred to; and possibly I may have so far succeeded as to give *prima facie* evidence of the existence of principles by which Scripture and natural science may be eventually reconciled. But I do not pretend to have been entirely successful in this endeavour; and, in fact, I have lately seen reason to give to my views on some particulars certain modifications, which I think it right to take this occasion for stating.

The modifications were suggested by a very original idea contained in Mr. Rorison's essay (p. 284), to which I am glad to be able to give my assent, viz., that the work of creation consists of *two groups of operations*. One group embraces the creative operations from the beginning of the first day to the end of the third, and culminates in organic inanimate creation; and the other, embracing the operations from the beginning of the fourth day to the end of the sixth, culminates in the creation of the highest order of animals and of man. This view being adopted, there will be no occasion for the assertion which I made, that

the luminaries of heaven are said to have been created on the fourth day, because on that day they first became visible to a supposed spectator on the earth. It is a sufficient reason for placing the creation of the sun in the second group, and immediately before the creation of animate organizations, that to many orders of animals the light and heat of the sun are necessary conditions of life, and more especially to man, to whom also the other luminaries are subservient; while many kinds of plants, as geology seems to shew, existed under influences of light and heat originating from the earth itself, when it was self-luminous.

This new idea being introduced into the theory, the following will be in brief the view that I now take of the scriptural account of the creation. That account is proleptical, not historic. The whole creation, as originally conceived in the mind of the Great Architect, consists of two parts; one relating to the conditions of inanimate organisms, and the other to those of animate. These two groups are each separated into three minor divisions. Accordingly, the objects created, considered apart from epoch and duration, consist of six classes: (1) waters and light; (2) the firmament and waters above it; (3) land separated from water and furnished with plants and trees; (4) the luminaries of heaven; (5) reptiles, winged animals, and fishes; (6) quadrupeds and man. In the original design of the Creator all the parts and conditions of each class must have been comprehended in one view, so that in a proleptical statement of the creation of any class, no one part, or condition, can be said to be created before another.

If enquiry now be made respecting the actual development of this scheme, and its relation to time, recourse must be had for information to the revelations of geology. From these we learn that the order of development is from inferior to superior, and from subordinate to principal; and that the organisms under the first group of creations generally preceded those under the other. Still the development was such that conditions of the life of plants and trees coexisted with conditions of the life of animals, and the periods over which the two classes of organisms extended were not conterminous, but overlapped. So also the separate creations which constitute the two groups, following the same law as the groups, were actually developed, so far as regards the organic bodies, in periods which were in part contemporaneous. With respect to the inorganic bodies, the science of astronomy teaches with much probability that the earth was not created before the sun, moon, and stars, but that the components of the solar system were brought simultaneously into existence, and at the same time, with the components of other systems.

Returning to the Biblical cosmogony, we find the several creations arranged in a certain order according to *days*. But as we have here to regard the cosmogony not as being unfolded, but as existing in thought and design, these days can have no actual duration. So much as this may, in truth, be inferred from Gen. ii. 4, where, although six days had been previously enumerated, mention is made of "the day in which the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, and every plant of the field." Consequently, the arrangement of the several creations accord-

ing to an order of days, only indicates the adaptability of the antecedently conceived scheme to progressive unfolding by course of time. And this view is confirmed by our being able to point out, by the aid of natural science, a succession of prominent facts corresponding to the asserted creations of the successive days. Natural science cannot, indeed, go so far back as to the very beginning of the creation, but does not refuse to regard as actual facts, corresponding to the description of the creations on the first day, that the earth was in its earliest stage covered with water and vapour of water, contemporaneously with the generation of light and heat. So also on the principles of natural science it may be admitted, that at a subsequent epoch the vapour of water was raised aloft in the form of a stratum of cloud, and separated from the fluid water below, in conformity with the creations ascribed to the second day. Corresponding to those of the third day, we have geological evidence of the operation at a very early epoch of forces by which the land was elevated above the level of the seas, and prepared for the growth of herbs and plants; and also examples of an abundant vegetation, produced apparently under influences of light and heat not derived from the sun. Then follows, according to geology, an epoch in which the earth's thermal conditions were changed, and, as may be presumed, it ceased to be self-luminous, and the influence of the light and heat of the sun, as experienced at present, began to be felt. The events of this epoch answer to the asserted creation of the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day. The extraordinary generation at a following epoch of reptiles, flying animals, and cetaceans, corresponds to the creations of the fifth day, and a final epoch of maximum generation of quadrupeds, succeeded by the creation of the human race, answers to the sixth day.

Respecting these coincidences one remark remains to be made. It may be objected that the asserted creation of the sun on the fourth day is contradicted by an admission already made, that the sun is at least as old as the earth. So also it may be objected that although there is geological evidence that reptiles and fishes were abundant at an epoch corresponding to the fifth day, they were not first created at that epoch, there being the same kind of evidence that they existed at epochs corresponding to previous days; and on similar grounds it may be urged that quadrupeds were not first created at an epoch corresponding to the sixth day. The answers to these three objections are all the same in principle. The scriptural statements are made proleptically respecting creations designed, but not in course of accomplishment. On this account, as was before remarked, the objects are regarded simply as created, with all their parts, functions, and conditions comprehended in one view, no distinction between these as to time being possible in such statements. The order in Gen. i. is determined by grouping, or relation, and follows the order of the above-enumerated correspondences, and not that of first creations. Farther, it may be remarked that the view of the Scripture cosmogony I have endeavoured to explain, viz., that it is a proleptical statement of operations extending actually from the beginning to the end of time (which, as we have seen, is also the view of Augustine), makes it prophetic rather than historical; and the diffi-

culties experienced in reconciling it with geological facts are of the very same kind as those met with in attempting to reconcile the prophecies of the Bible with facts of history.

Cambridge, Sept. 6, 1862.

J. CHALLIS.

A SECULARIST CONVERTED.

A LITTLE book has just appeared, sufficiently remarkable in itself, its subject, and its author, to justify some notice of it in your Journal.*

John Henry Gordon made his first appearance at Leeds a short time since as the accredited "Lecturer to the Leeds Secular (i. e. infidel) Society." This little association consisted of about forty members. Its efforts had been hitherto confined to the promotion of "Sunday Bands," the encouragement of Sunday tippling and travelling, and to the milder and more money-making modes of popular demoralization; a fraction of our forty consisting of innkeepers and others having a direct pecuniary interest in the sale of spirituous drinks! Its success, however, had been by no means marked, up to his appearance about a year and a half ago; but a new epoch dawned upon the somewhat drooping prospects of "secularism" at Leeds when our hero bounced upon the platform. A circular challenge was addressed by him to each of the clergymen, and ministers of the district, calling upon them to defend, if they could, the perishing dogmas of their doomed faith. Every Sunday evening, before large and increasing audiences, our lecturer's trenchant axe swung in his sinewy arm, inflicting stroke after stroke upon one or other of the straggling branches of the tree of the old belief until it fell with a crash, to the entire satisfaction of the assembly, testified by vociferous cheers. It was utterly in vain to attempt to answer him. His clever logical fence, his ready wit, and his foul mouth, insured him the victory against all comers. It is true that some zealous Christians repelled his open-air attacks upon the faith with a shower of brickbats, following herein doubtless the example of Henry, Earl of Moreland, who answered an infidel objection with a kick, no better argument being at hand (see *Fool of Quality*). It must, however, be acknowledged that this mode of defence says more for the zeal than the Christianity of the defender, and moreover, seldom answers its purpose. Under Gordon's administration, the Leeds Secular Society had increased from forty to one hundred and forty members! He was overwhelmed with invitations to lecture in other towns, and at the very zenith of his popularity, when the marvellous change came over him, which it is the object of his little book to detail.

Gordon had been piously educated so long as he remained under his mother's care. He speaks with much feeling of "the curly-headed

* *The Public Statement of Mr. John H. Gordon, with references to his repudiation of Secular Principles, and his adoption of the Christian Faith.* Leeds: J. Hamer.

little boy kneeling at his good mother's knee, and repeating the Lord's Prayer" (p. 5). It was through her influence that he became an apt Sunday scholar, then the head boy in the Bible class, and afterwards a very regular teacher in the Sunday school of one of the dissenting congregations in his native city of Carlisle. Even at this time, he tells us, he was harrassed with the doubts which at length landed him on the platform of the Leeds Secular Society.

It was on the 13th of last month (July 1862) that his mother, to whom he is strongly attached, was visiting him at Leeds. With the greatest difficulty he had prevailed upon her to remain with him over that day, being Sunday. She had assented on the express condition that he accompanied her in the morning to the chapel of Rev. G. W. Conder, an eminent dissenting minister in the town. The sermon, by Gordon's account of it, was carefully considered, ably put together, and well delivered, but by no means remarkable in any way. But he sate by his mother, and his father at Carlisle had heard of the agreement, and foregoing all other engagements, "he entered into his closet, and shutting his doors about him, prayed to Him who seeth in secret" as only a father can pray, who intercedes for his first-born son!

Gordon returned home very uneasy. Doubts regarding his course of life had long been floating in his mind, and all these the sermon had gathered to a head. He, however, said nothing, but when he again left the house to give his ordinary Sunday evening's defence of infidelity, the shade of sorrow on his mother's brow smote him like a cold chill. He, however, appeared on the platform, blurting out blasphemies more boldly than ever, and blighting his luckless opponents with such withering sarcasms, that the rafters shook with the bravoës of his hearers, and he was congratulated everywhere on the achievement of his greatest success! He had only been "whistling aloud to keep his courage up!" The sermon kept him awake and in painful debate with himself throughout the night; and when early on the Monday morning he took leave of his mother at the railway station, she remarked upon his jaded anxious looks,—but he gave no explanation. On his return home, he wrote to the preacher, but received no answer. He also left Leeds the same morning, not to return until late in the week, as it appeared afterwards. Now comes the real marvel of Gordon's deeply interesting narrative. Unaided by word or sign from any human being, he crossed alone, amid agonies and horrors literally ineffable, the yawning dizzy gulf that separates the rabid blaspheming atheist from the humble devout believer in the atonement of Jesus Christ.

The Friday following (July 18) was Gordon's twenty-fourth birthday. On that day also he was born again! To adopt his own phrase, "he rose from his bed a secularist unbeliever, he returned to it a confident and confiding Christian." It was late in the evening; he had given up the struggle with his convictions, and resolved to continue his lectures and the rest of his former course of life. He stated this to his wife, expressing at the same time his utter inability to cope with the destitution which his resignation of his post would inflict upon her and her infant; and with the sneers, the humiliations, the anxieties, the rounds of cares

into which both would be hurled by the change to which his conscience urged him. Her reply was honest, straightforward and womanly, as her husband rightly terms it,—“But what has that to do with it?” He gave her no reply, but went to his chamber; and in about half an hour, bounding down stairs, and hurrying to his wife, he exclaimed, “I have found it, I have found it.” And he had found it. He had caught hold of, and held fast, the exact pinch of the case between the atheist and the believer. The mad absurdity of his demand hitherto, that every particular of the great enigma of man’s life and being should be submitted to the judgment and decision of his frail erring reason, struck him in a moment. The truth beamed upon him like an electric flash. As he proceeds to say, simply and beautifully, “I had got through the deep gloom, and if all was not bright yet, I had got into the brightness. I need not say we were both very, very glad.”

The next day Gordon gave up his appointment as lecturer to the secular society—*his whole living*. On the Monday he issued a circular to the clergy, withdrawing his former one, stating his change of views, and asking to be received as a Christian brother. A week or two afterwards he called a public meeting for the purpose of delivering a statement of his reasons for this great change. His former friends, however, were too much enraged to listen, and had converted the assembly into a hopeless impracticable uproar before he began. He has therefore published the clear and ably composed statement which they would not hear. It will repay perusal as a psychological phenomenon, if on no other grounds.

O.



Jerusalem.—An Interesting Discovery.—We learn that the foundation of the inner wall of Jerusalem (referred to in Lam. ii. 8, under the name of rampart, and also Isaiah xxii. 11, where the two walls are spoken of), has lately been discovered. As far as it has been laid bare, it consists of very large stones, and the solid masonry is just the same as that of the western wall of the temple. It is about four yards distant from the present wall. The spot was visited by many Europeans, among whom are mentioned the Austrian and French Consuls, as also by Dr. Rosen, the Prussian Consul, distinguished for his topographical knowledge of the Holy City, and they all agreed in pronouncing this remnant of heavy antiquity the foundation of the “rampart.” It was discovered while digging to lay the foundation for a new building, “Abode of Peace,” erecting for the Jewish poor at the expense of a deceased benefactor. On the same plot of ground was also discovered a very large, equally ancient, cistern, 36 yards long, by 5½ wide and 14 deep.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

An Introduction to the Old Testament, Critical, Historical, and Theological; containing a discussion of the most important questions belonging to the several books. By SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D. Vol. II. London: Williams and Norgate. 1862.

WE have already stated our general opinions as to the field occupied by Dr. Davidson, the legitimacy of his enquiries, and the character of his proceedings and conclusions. There is nothing to add or alter as to what we have said. We concede to Dr. Davidson the perfect right to prosecute his investigations, and to record his conclusions; but we claim for ourselves the right to approve or reject, to criticise or to allow as we think fit. In our eyes, his book is more than an introduction, it is a challenge addressed to orthodox critics, and it remains to be seen if the challenge will be accepted. In the meantime, we shall simply and shortly state the course pursued in this new volume, and make some passing observations.

The volume commences with the books of Kings, which, as Dr. Davidson observes, were formerly but one. After a copious analysis, the following topics are discussed,—unity and diversity; sources; date and authorship; nature of the history; general scope; the prophets in 1 Kings xxii. 6, and Elisha's conduct to the children. It is maintained that the unity and independence of the work are attested by internal evidence, but as the books are a compilation their unity cannot be very close or exact. Hence, sometimes one part contradicts another; relations are represented as existing after the time, when the history itself shews they were done away; and other incongruities, etc., occur. Some of these objections we look on as of no importance, and rather as indicative of a disposition to aggravate them instead of amending them. Take the first: in 1 Kings xxi. 19, we read, "In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." Now Naboth was slain near Jezreel, but Ahab's blood was licked up at Samaria, as may be seen in chap. xxii. 38. Dr. Davidson might have noticed that the blood of Jezebel, Ahab's wife, was licked up in Jezreel. There is an unquestionable difficulty in the case. Verses 17 to 19 inform us that the Lord gave a certain message to Elijah, including the words we have quoted. Verses 20 to 24 record the actual circumstances of the interview, but do not say that Elijah uttered any such words to Ahab or himself. They do say that something like it was spoken of Jezebel. Here, in our view, lies the true problem which has to be solved. The historian represents Elijah as receiving one message and delivering another. The message he actually delivered found its literal accomplishment. We must not, with Dr. Davidson, lower the importance of chap. xxi. 29, where it is expressly declared that Ahab's repentance should mitigate the calamities of his house, or at least postpone them. The dogs did lick up his blood, but the dis-

grace did not befall him in Jezreel. And surely all the divine threatenings are conditional, and in their effects may be modified to any extent on the repentance of those to whom they are directed.

The sharpness of Dr. Davidson's criticism is even more apparent in his next example. In 1 Kings xxii. 51, we read that Ahaziah son of Ahab began to reign in the seventeenth year of Jehoshaphat. This, we are told, does not agree with other statements. Jehoshaphat began to reign in the fourth year of Ahab, *i.e.*, "the latter had reigned three years." "Now if Ahaziah succeeded in Jehoshaphat's seventeenth year, Ahab could only have reigned nineteen or twenty." The conclusion arrived at is that Ahaziah could not have succeeded till the twenty-first of Jehoshaphat. This is preposterous. By comparing ver. 41 with ver. 51, we find that four years of Ahab's reign may fairly be added to seventeen of Jehoshaphat's, so that Ahaziah succeeded in the twenty-first of Ahab. But Ahab reigned twenty-two years, and therefore some method of reconciling the discrepancy is to be looked for. The reconciliation may be found in the designation of years when a little more or a little less is intended. It follows that discrepancies of at least one year may be continually expected in computations like these. This is not all: there are cases in which we have clear evidence that the successor was appointed regent during the life of his predecessor. However, we leave this question for others to decide, with the simple remark, that upon such reasonings important conclusions cannot be based.

Dr. Davidson believes that the books of Kings were compiled between 561 and 536 B.C., that is, soon after the latest event recorded in them. He attaches no small weight to what he regards as legendary, traditional, mythological, and exaggerated elements. High numbers and miracles are equally subject to animadversion. As for the numbers, we all know that errors sometimes appear among them. In our judgment they are the most vulnerable or exposed portions of the Hebrew text. With the miracles, the case is not so. We believe the supernatural statements of the Bible, although we may not be able to answer every question which may be put about them. Right or wrong, we are content to take on trust, or receive by faith, the things which belong to faith rather than to reason. It may be our weakness, but we believe the works.

The course adopted with the Chronicles resembles that already noticed in the case of the Kings. There is much that is ingenious and probable in the account of the sources drawn upon, but we have no wish to disguise our dissent from not a few of the statements made here as elsewhere. Once for all, we do not approve of the tone almost of depreciation which continually strikes our notice. Grant that Dr. Davidson feels all he says, and we do not doubt it, is it necessary to speak depreciatingly, or even worse, of writers and books which Jews and Christians have for so many ages agreed to reverence as divine? We may be told that he always speaks religiously and reverently of the highest things. And this is true, but at the same time we believe

a better effect would have been produced if he had avoided many harsh expressions. Altogether, apart from the question of right and wrong, a writer who is controversial had better exceed in gentleness towards his adversaries. We call this work controversial, and it is pre-eminently such, for it controverts in every page something "quod semper, quod ubique, quod omnibus receptum." If we admit that Dr. Davidson's work may render great service to the cause of sacred criticism, we shall only say the truth; while, however, common honesty compels us to say this, honesty also requires us to say that we differ essentially from the learned writer on a number of doctrinal and critical points. The lists and statements of real or apparent discrepancies are not superfluous. It is one part of criticism to discover such things if they exist, just as it is another part of criticism to explain, rectify, or reconcile them. We are convinced that some of Dr. Davidson's instances are only supposed, while others are real. The former may be traced to misconception, the latter to errors of transcription. No intelligent scholar, we presume, will say that there are no obscurities which have as yet refused solution, or that there are no errors in the text. As for the former, we must wait for further light, and the same is true of the latter. Meanwhile what we know is abundantly sufficient to sustain and justify our faith.

Ezra and Nehemiah come next. They were at one time regarded as one book, but were at an early date divided into two. Dr. Davidson thinks that Ezra was written or compiled by the compiler of the books of Chronicles, and originally formed part of the same work. He thinks that Nehemiah wrote only a portion of the book which bears his name. He says the captivity in Babylon lasted but forty-nine or fifty years from the fall of Jerusalem. Esther has true history as its basis, but is dressed out with a number of imaginary details and circumstances; and it was written about 300—290 B.C.

The book of Job is submitted to a long and searching examination. Job himself is regarded as belonging to a patriarchal age, but the book is not earlier than the seventh century B.C. Without attempting to indicate the course pursued in relation to this book, we may express our great surprise to find our author asserting that the writer of the book of Job was acquainted with the fable of the phoenix. He refers to chap. xxix. 18, "I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days as the sand." The word rendered "sand" is by some Hebrew writers applied to the phoenix, but Gesenius does not adopt this explanation, neither does Fürst, though both mention it. The Vulgate translates *palma*. The LXX. have "phoenix," but the word means either phoenix or palm-tree. The Targum has "sand" or "phoenix," for the word is ambiguous. No doubt the Rabbins took their notion from the ambiguity of the Greek word. The Syriac has "sand of the seas" to prevent mistake; and the Arabic in Walton's polyglott is the same. We do not believe for a moment that the view which explains the verse of the fabulous phoenix can be sustained by any fact except the rabbinical glosses, which are not very ancient.

The remaining books noticed by Dr. Davidson are, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon. Of all these we have much to say, but it is impossible for us to find space for their discussion. We therefore turn to the closing chapter of the volume, on prophecy, and with a word or two about it, we shall conclude. The chapter is long, and is skilfully and ably written. Its author animadverts upon various errors which have no doubt attached themselves to the study of prophecy, as popularly pursued by men who have neither the talent nor the learning which are required. But while the mistakes of others are pointed out, is it not to be feared that other and even grave mistakes have been committed? Let us candidly avow our conviction that Dr. Davidson has given up so much, that what he retains is but a fragment or a shadow of the old belief on this matter. In his definition of prophets he says that "speaking generally, prophets may be described as persons who perceive the will and counsel of God respecting the destinies of men in any way and by any signs whatever. Nor do they merely *apprehend* His will; they explain and announce it." This may be true so far as it goes, but it is inadequate; and it is felt to be so, hence it is added, that "in a more limited sense, we call those prophets who are confidants of God; to whom He has revealed himself that they may communicate his will to mankind. They are thus messengers or heralds." Not even is this satisfactory. It admits a revelation, but the terms would apply partly to any preacher of God's Word, and altogether to such inspired men as may have uttered no prophecy whatever in the ordinary sense of the word. The definition given afterwards of prophecy does not remove our difficulty. We are glad to find the Hebrew prophets recognized as "public orators, to proclaim and enforce divine truths and laws," but we want much more than this; we require even more than the admission that they had a *presentiment* of the near future, and that they *anticipated* in glowing and graphic language the glories of Messiah's reign. We know not how to reconcile the statements we find,—the admission of a revelation and of the supernatural, and yet the apparent reference of prophetic phenomena to a certain combination of natural and of divine power. Is it true that "wherever definite predictions having special details occur, particularly in relation to *times*, it can be shewn that they are supposititious; or that the whole prophecy is spurious, *e.g.*, the predictions respecting Cyrus in Isaiah, etc., which are unauthentic? In like manner Daniel's predictions are spurious." Dr. Davidson says this, but for the proof we have to wait. It is of course easy to denounce as spurious what we do not approve of, *e.g.*, Isa. vii. 8, and xxxviii., but this fails to satisfy enquiry. We may lay down as a principle, and yet be wrong in saying that "minute and specific traits of this nature should always be regarded as a presumption against the authenticity, because they are contrary to the general analogy of prophecy;"—*i.e.*, of course prophecy as we understand it. May we say that "the essential part of Biblical prophecy does not lie in predicting contingent events, but in *divining the essentially religious* in

the course of history?" We know not what to do with our author; he admits what agrees with his theory, and denies the authenticity of those passages which are against it. A host of the passages thus condemned are mentioned in the chapter.

To our mind one thing is clear; that if the spurious and interpolated only bears a small proportion to the space assigned it by Dr. Davidson, the Old Testament is one of the most corrupt texts in existence. No book that we know of has been tampered with to anything like the same extent. Is it really so? And in addition to the interpolations, are the blunders of the writers so frequent as we are told? We are assured moreover, that "we may safely assert that in no place or prophecy can it be shewn that the literal predicting of distant historical events is contained!" Were the prophets merely men who only felt as it were beforehand,—"*sooner and more acutely sensible than all other men,—the approaching future?*" Again, is it correct that "the prophet's delineations of the future are in essence nothing but forebodings," or "intensified presentiment?" Nay, are we right in believing that true prophets uttered prophecies which were not fulfilled? We waive what is said of Messianic predictions, because we have not space to dispose of them, but we must protest against the declaration that the expectation of a Messiah "arose after David, at a time of national deterioration;" and that the prophetism of the Old Testament only lies between 1100 and 400 B.C.

We will say no more. We admire the learning and patient research of our author, we thank him for his undoubted facts, we honour him for his bold outspokenness, and we learn much from his pages. It is nevertheless with feelings of sadness and of sorrow that we lay down this volume. It and its predecessor contain somewhat about a thousand pages, and it would not be easy to find a thousand pages which exhibit more unmistakeably the qualities we have mentioned. But the criticism is fearfully destructive. We look back upon the books preceding the prophets, and we ask how many of the old landmarks have been removed? We look forward at the prophets through the perspective of the closing chapter before us, and we ask how many of the old landmarks will be allowed to remain?

We concede that Dr. Davidson has a right to publish what he thinks, and to think as he publishes; and we are convinced that ordinary Old Testament critics are very defective; but this must not be construed into an endorsement of all that is contained in the volumes we have read. In all honesty and sincerity we are convinced that there is much chaff mixed with the corn, and much tares among the wheat.

Letters from Rome to Friends in England. By the Rev. JOHN W. BURGON, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College. London: John Murray, 1862.

THIS rather handsome volume is pleasant and instructive reading, and

abounds in facts which it concerns most of us to know. The book is thrown into the form of letters, not because they were written at Rome, which they were not, but because they embody the mementoes of a visit and residence at Rome, and because letters furnish a form into which very miscellaneous matters may be cast. Circumstances have prevented us from noticing this work earlier, and even now we can give no more space to it than will suffice barely to describe the course which has been followed by the author.

The first letter consists of various matters relating to the journey, what sights the tourist witnesses on his way to Rome. This need not detain us: we come then to the second and third letters, which are devoted to the subject of the Codex Vaticanus, or the Codex B. Mr. Burgon *saw* this MS. several times, and once had the opportunity of examining it for an hour and a half. He describes it as a quarto volume, bound in red morocco, about four and a half inches thick; the vellum pages being ten and a half inches high and ten inches across. Every page contains three columns, and there are about seventeen or eighteen letters in a line. The caligraphy is exquisite, and the MS., though it has not been always well used, is in admirable condition. Mr. Burgon complains of the inaccuracy of the so-called facsimiles, Mai's included, and says that the original "more resembles, in the general character of the letters, one of the ancient rolls found at Herculaneum, than anything else. There is no space between any of the words; nor was there, I believe, originally a single capital letter to be seen in the volume from one end to the other. No part of the MS. has at any time been miniated. There is an occasional division into paragraphs, but for several consecutive pages the writing is often continuous." The absence of miniated letters is a peculiarity in which, as in other respects, it differs from the Codex Alexandrinus, as shewn by Mr. Burgon. There is but one entire column left blank in the Codex. The whole account of the volume is very interesting, and all the more so for a facsimile of the last verse of St. John's Gospel, executed from a photograph. After describing Codex B, Mr. Burgon proceeds to notice the work of Cardinal Mai, and the reprint of the New Testament by Vercellone. What he says on this subject is, for the most part, very good, and accords with the prevalent opinion that the work is not well done. The Roman editions do not agree with one another, and neither of them faithfully represents the MS.; of these facts abundant evidence is adduced.

Letters four to eleven contain a host of facts and observations relating to rites and ceremonies, services, relics, images, and other matters ecclesiastical. There is something very saddening in this description of what passes for religion at Rome. It shews clearly enough, how, in course of time, there has been a wonderful accumulation of abuses, impostures, errors, and superstitions of all sorts there, where religion might have so easily been preserved pure and undefiled. Such a mass of rubbish can be found in no other city in the world. No doubt these things contribute to the wealth and power of the hierarchy, but do they

not also contribute to the ignorance and worldliness of the people? Do they not also encourage delusion and fraud in other places? Faint indeed are the traces of the primitive and apostolic faith and practice, which we can discover in Mr. Burgon's sketches. We conclude that for spiritual purposes religion at Rome is utterly inoperative; that Rome is practically without the Gospel, as its people are really without the Bible, for what is described in these pages is emphatically not the Christianity of the New Testament, nor that of the first few centuries.

Letters twelve to twenty treat of the Roman catacombs and ancient Christian monuments and inscriptions. They will supply a rare treat to the student of such matters, for graphically as the author writes, his pages are made still more life-like by numerous illustrations and copies of inscriptions. In the course of our time, we have read much about these matters, and we therefore find a number of things with which we are already familiar. But we have been really gratified with the new facts and suggestions of Mr. Burgon, although very much that he says has an apologetical bearing. He would not merely shew us what is written and carved upon these venerable remains, but he would interpret the lessons with which they are fraught.

The twenty-first letter is about some of the sights of Rome, including a walk in the Ghetto, or Jews' quarter. This last goes to confirm what others have said, but it is not made so much of as it might have been. The condition of Jews at Rome is a fulfilment of prophecy, it may be, and so is their persistent rejection of the gospel; nor do we complain that Mr. Burgon points to them and says, "Did not the apostle prophesy truly when he added, that 'the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it?'" If by the Gentiles here, the modern Romans are meant; and by the salvation of God, the gospel, we fear the modern Romans do not hear much, if more, of the Gospel than the Jews. So long as the missal, and the breviary, and the Bible are muttered only in Latin to the Italians, so long will they not hear the salvation of God; and so long as Mariolatry and other abominations are predominant, the Gospel of Christ cannot be heard. No doubt there is truth even in Rome, but so overlaid and interwoven with error that Christianity sees there her caricature rather than her true portrait. As for the poor Jews, we consider their state in Rome not only as an illustration of prophecy, but as a standing disgrace to their sacerdotal rulers, who have not known how "parcere subjectis," though they may have learned the "debellare superbos." The fact is, (and what can be more condemnatory of the Pope's government and principles?) that the Jew in Rome is in this year of grace 1862 regarded precisely as he was when Juvenal lashed the vices of Roman pagans in apostolic times. Christianity has done nothing to improve the social position of the Jew in Rome.

Mr. Burgon's twenty-second and twenty-third letters relate to a journey and observations between Rome and Pæstum. Among much that is interesting, we notice a wood-cut representing a basket with a convex bottom, used at Sorrento and called a *coffano*. In this basket

our author finds the *cophinus* of the New Testament (St. Matt. xvi. 9, 10; St. Mark viii. 19, 20). We really cannot say whether the *cophinus* was of the shape here indicated, although Mr. Burgon does not seem to doubt it. The name is exceedingly likely to be the same, and its persistence in Southern Italy will not surprize the classical reader. The word is a very old one; it certainly occurs in Aristophanes, as well as in Xenophon; it is to be found in the LXX. also, and others before our era.

The twenty-fourth and two following letters, with which the volume closes, are mainly occupied with the differences and questions in dispute between the Churches of Rome and England. This, however, is ground upon which we will not enter. Mr. Burgon is a thorough Churchman, and stands up bravely and strongly in defence of the Church; but he is not a bitter and narrow-minded disputant. He reverences true antiquity, and is quite prepared for any consequences which may follow the study of the genuine history, writings, and monuments of the first ages. We do not agree with all the opinions expressed, though we do accept the leading position, that what may not be proved from Holy Scripture and the genuine remains of the first ages, cannot be safely adopted or defended as Catholic and apostolic.

The origin of the "Te Deum" has been inquired into in the pages of this Journal. Upon this subject Mr. Burgon says (p. 329), "The 'Te Deum' of the western Church, is, I believe, the beautiful development (expansion I should rather have called it) of a short Eastern hymn, the germ of which is contained in the Trisagion, or cry of the Seraphim, as recorded by the prophet Isaiah, chap. vi." We should say it comes of the conjunction of the *Trisagion* and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which have by successive developments evolved the "Te Deum."

Here, then, we take our leave of a very pleasant book; a book with which we sympathize, and which has supplied us with more than recreation. We have noticed it mainly because of what it says of the famous Codex B, and of the catacombs: the one involving some of the more interesting problems of sacred literature, and the other, problems so manifold, that we will not attempt to enumerate them. In a word, Codex B may help to shew us how the text of the New Testament was written; the catacombs, how it was interpreted in the primitive church.

The Gospel according to St. John, translated from the eleven Oldest Versions, except the Latin, and compared with the English Bible. With notes on every one of the alterations proposed by the Five Clergymen, in their Revised Version of this Gospel, published in 1857. By the Rev. S. C. MALAN, M.A. London: Joseph Masters. 1862.

WE have here a substantial quarto volume which cannot fail to be attractive to Biblical students. It comprises a preface, translations,

and notes. The text exhibits twelve translations at each opening, besides numerous foot-notes: and these are followed by 134 pages of notes upon the revised version mentioned in the title page. The versions which have been translated into English by Mr. Malan are the Syriac-Peshito, the Ethiopic, Sahidic, Memphitic, and Gothic, the Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic, the Anglo-Saxon, Arabic, and Persian. All these are undoubtedly ancient versions, although some of them are not older than a few other versions still extant, as Mr. Malan is quite aware. The dates he ascribes to the several translations may be mentioned for the sake of any of our readers who do not remember them. The Syriac-Peshito was made probably late in the first or towards the middle of the second century: the Ethiopic version probably in the fourth century; the Armenian early in the fifth century; the Georgian in the sixth century according to some, in the eighth according to others, but may have been earlier than either: the Slavonic in the ninth century; the Sahidic probably in the second century; the Memphitic in the second or third century; the Gothic in the fourth century; the Anglo-Saxon in the eighth or ninth century; the Arabic probably in the eleventh century; the Persian in the fourteenth century.

Mr. Malan is a great admirer of our Authorized English Version, and he says much in its deserved honour. He believes that the Authorized Version is as fair a representative of the Greek text as any of the old translations, which he here puts into English for the convenience of ordinary readers, who may now institute a comparison for themselves. He does not plead that the readings or that the renderings of the Authorized Version are always immaculate, but he does believe that it would be as dangerous as it would be difficult to substitute for that version another, or even any formal revision. His conclusion is, "let it alone;" and he would assent at most to a few verbal alterations in the case of St. John's gospel which he has selected as a specimen. He does not even think that the results of criticism require any alterations of the Greek text from which our version was made. To a great extent we go with him, but not quite to the full extent. We have no wish to see our version supplanted, but we are willing that it should be subject to competent examination and criticism. Over and over again critical editions of the authorized translation have been advocated in this Journal. Why should it be that so little has been attempted in this way? Why are the ears of the public filled with ominous rumours of corrupt readings and renderings, while they are excluded from the means of ascertaining the facts of the case? With the aid of the printer and the briefest scholia, all important suggestions might be shewn, and if necessary, the authorities for them. The English Bible is a glorious heritage, and we welcome every one whose scholarship justifies him in lauding it like Mr. Malan. We are glad to see that progress is being made towards such critical editions as we have indicated. New translations have their dangers, if they have their uses. Thus much we freely say, but

the subject has been recently before our readers, and we will add no more at present.

We are sorry to think that there are few men competent to pronounce a critical opinion upon all the translations of Mr. Malan. We do not pretend to do it. Some of the languages we do not understand at all, and others not well enough to criticise a translation. It is well known that even Greek scholars may be found who assert that in John i. 1, the words *καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος* should be rendered "and God was the Word." But better scholars are aware that the true sense is indicated by the position of the article, and can be unambiguously expressed in English by saying with our version, "and the Word was God." Now let us take this verse, and shew how it is represented in the translations of Mr. Malan.

Authorized Version: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Syriac: In the beginning was the Word, and that Word was with God, and God was that Word.

Ethiopic: First is the Word, and that Word is with God, and God is the Word.

Armenian: From the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word.

Georgian: From the first was *the* Word, and that Word was with God, and God was that Word.

Slavonic: In the beginning was *the* Word, and *the* Word was with God, and God was *the* Word.

Sahidic: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word.

Memphitic: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word.

Gothic: (Lost).

Anglo-Saxon: At the first was *the* Word, and that Word was with God, and God was that Word.

Arabic: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God he is the Word.

Persian: In the beginning was *the* Word, and *the* Word was in presence of God, and God is the Word.

It is not our intention to touch upon the questions at issue between Mr. Malan and the Five Clergymen, but we may say that in his notes he gives us a large mass of valuable criticism, a critical commentary almost, which readers who can understand it will greatly prize. To the scholar it will not be by any means the least useful part of this excellent volume. There are cases of course in which we see differently from our author, but we often agree with him, and we always prize the information which he gives with so lavish a hand. We feel greatly indebted to the industry and learning of the editor everywhere, but especially here.

We may observe, with reference to the versions, that Mr. Malan has sought to make them from the best editions, and to make them

as literal as practicable. He has done right in this, as it is the only means of rendering this part of his work available for critical purposes. He has possibly sometimes carried literalness to an excess, but this is a fault on the safe side, and one which every scholar will most willingly pardon.

There is much more that we could say, descriptive or commendatory, of this volume; but we forbear, and simply recommend it to the student as an important addition to his means for ascertaining the true sense of that gospel which all ages have revered for its divine simplicity and sublimity, as well as for its divine inspiration. Let us, however, as we close the book, congratulate Mr. Malan, not merely for the completion of this great and blessed labour, but on having found a printer who has produced a fine and seemingly most accurate specimen of typography, involving the use of quite a variety of Oriental and other alphabets.

Welches Bekenntniss. Von der Verfasserin von *Suchen und Finden*. ("Which Creed? By the authoress of *Seek and Find*.") Berlin; 1862.

THIS little book is an offspring of the resistance offered in Germany to the aggressive spirit of Roman Catholicism. Most of the old Protestant answers to the claims of an infallible church, a mediating priesthood, and other Romish dogmas, are revived and presented to the reader in the shape of a conversation between a brother and a sister. The sister has married a Roman Catholic, but has sufficient influence over his affections to persuade him to allow their children to be educated in the Evangelical faith. Two promising boys however die, and both husband and wife take the Divine dispensation to heart; but while the wife yearns after their salvation, and feels workings in her soul of a new and powerful kind, directing her thoughts towards a more vital religion than she has as yet experienced, her husband looks upon the calamity as a judgment sent upon them for not bringing up the children in the Catholic faith. He resolves to educate the remaining child, a daughter, as a Catholic, and his wife, overcome with her own anxieties and this impending evil, writes to her brother, the friend and adviser of her youth, for advice. Hereupon ensues a correspondence, the result of which is that peace and joy return to the house, and the daughter, whose own tendencies are Evangelical, is brought up in her mother's creed. The chief faults in this work are that the Bible is too exclusively held up as the only religion, while the assumption of an infallible church is properly contradicted; too much reliance is placed on the immediate communion which an individual can obtain with God. The sacraments are indeed insisted upon as most important aids to faith, and the necessity of belonging to some visible communion is dwelt upon. Still all is very shadowy and unreal, as long as the birthright of every baptised person is thrown into the back-ground. Great stress is laid upon humility, and

a sacrifice of self; but that is surely compatible with a deferential regard to the teaching of the Church, and with a sense of our filial relation to our Father in heaven by means of His Son's life-giving ordinance.

There is too much theory in the book to make it suitable for more than a certain number of persons, whose ideas are cast in the same mould as those of the authoress. Most Christians require a support derivable, not merely from their own subjective interpretation of Scripture, but from those ends which carry the weight of an authority which, although not infallible in itself, is almost so to them; otherwise, as the authoress herself admits, almost anything may be made out of Scripture, so long as the interpreter is consciously, or unconsciously, influenced by an antecedent set of ideas. We give a specimen of the book:—

“No! my Dorothy, seek salvation, not exclusively, nor by preference in a Church which, with itself, beautiful services, with its rich offerings, takes captive the feelings, and awakens the glowings of an excitable fancy; seek it from the Lord himself, from Him alone who may be found in every Christian communion, and who approaches you in the pure sacrament of the Evangelical Church as though He—as in the apostolic circle—were speaking His first words of consecration, and holding His first passover with thee. He will come to thee. Thou wilt seek Him afresh at the altar of thy church, which received and brought thee up, to which thou hast given thy adhesion; neglect it not. Seek Him, and thou wilt find Him.”—p. 150.

††

Specielle Einleitung in die Kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments.
Von J. J. STÄHELIN. Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs.

Dr. STÄHELIN is a diligent investigator of matters pertaining to the Old Testament. His present work, or special introduction to the canonical books, is one of great research and learning; and it is characterized by the same tendency to leave the ancient landmarks behind, which is at present a prominent feature in Old Testament criticism. The Pentateuch is of course not an original work, and its compilation took place long after the age of Moses. The book of Joshua is also subject to dissection in accordance with the fragment hypothesis, and is associated in its compilation with the first five books. The book of Judges is drawn into the same net, along with a portion of the first book of Samuel. The scribe who arranged these, used older materials, among which was one book of considerable importance, but it was only one of several. This collector and compiler did his work in the time of Samuel. Such is the idea of Dr. Stähelin, who is so intent upon his critical researches, that he forgets too much the moral difficulties which lie around him. It is not easy to see how the man who compiled one-third of the Old Testament, should have been able to preserve the anonymous so perfectly; nor how the Jewish nation were induced to accept so much under the name of Moses, which was not written, or not in substantially the same form during the four hundred years from Moses to Samuel. There must have been fraud on the one

hand, and the most culpable credulity on the other. The work thus edited must either have come out as a new book, or as an old one, or as both old and new. If the former, how came the people to regard so much of it as coeval with Joshua? If the second, how came they to be so easily duped? If the third, how and in what sense did they understand the words? We cannot imagine a man coming to the Jews with the Pentateuch, and saying, "This is the work of Moses, written four hundred years since, always in your possession, the religious and civil and social guide and statute-book of the nation,—the one book with whose contents all are required to be familiar, and which contains your noblest history;" if they were not already in possession of such a book. They were, or they were not, in possession of the work. If they were, it was not then first written, nor very materially altered; if they were not in possession of it, that generation of Jews at least were sheer fools, which Jews commonly are not. If a man now-a-days were to produce a book and call it a contemporary record of the deposition and death of Henry VI., and other events which about that time occurred in our own history, there are very few who would be unable to say whether it was genuine or not; fewer still who would not know whether it had always been a work of public interest; and none at all who would not be aware whether it was everywhere regarded as a sacred document, the rule of religion, morality, national and domestic life. If the logic of facts is inexorable, there is a moral logic not much more exorable.

Dr. Stähelin pursues his way through all the books of the Old Testament, and with the aid of philology, verbal and comparative criticism, analogies, etc., succeeds in once more overturning the commonly-received theories on many matters, and setting up rivals of his own creation or adoption. Amid all this there is much that is true and valuable, but it is our impression that in the present unsettled and unsatisfactory state of Old Testament criticism, the chief use of these works is in detecting and expounding the problems which have to be solved. We are inclined to think that but for the lynx eyes and sharp nails of a school which has done more than scratch over the surface, many of us might have lived and died, like our fathers, in happy ignorance of the uncertainty we are in respecting ten thousand things in the Old Testament. In the battle between science and tradition, science will always be in danger of unbelief, and of seeming to assail faith and religion itself: it will be apt to become pretentious and self-confident, and we shall hear it chanting self-laudatory pæans over its easy conquests. But it always happens that after the first flush of fear and dislike on the one hand, and of satisfaction and assurance on the other, a middle class rises up, and enlists the sobrieties of science in favour of the verities of the Word of God, the realities which that Word enshrines.

Dr. Stähelin's book is one which we differ from very much, but we are glad to see it, and may safely pronounce it both able and valuable.

The Religions before Christ: being an Introduction to the History of the first three centuries of the Church. By EDWARD DE PRESSENSE. Translated by L. CORKRAN. With Preface by the Author. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

THIS volume contains the introduction to M. de Pressensé's work on the first three centuries of the Church; and all who study that work should make themselves acquainted with the principles of this essay. The essay may be viewed as complete in itself, but the subsequent history cannot be so well understood without it. The author states his aim in his preface; "I have endeavoured to shew that the whole of the ancient world, notwithstanding its depravity and shortcomings, concluded by desiring and seeking the 'unknown God,' by demanding him from all forms of worship, from all schools of philosophy." While, however, he makes so large a concession as is here implied, a concession which even Dr. Temple is unwilling to make in his well known essay on the "Education of the World," he adds, "The work of preparation in the pagan world consisted in the development of this immense, this painful desire,—too often, alas! sullied and alloyed; but it was a flame kindled by God himself, and could not be extinguished." In speaking of Dr. Temple, we have in mind that passage where, in speaking of Greece, he seems to deny that Greece had really any religion at all, and says, "Her gods were the creatures of imagination, not of spiritual need;" and that "Greece in fact was not looking at another world, nor even striving to organize the present, but rather aiming at the development of free nature," etc. (p. 17.)

M. de Pressensé disclaims the intention of flattering human pride, although he hopes that Christians will rejoice to think that from the beginning the whole race of Adam was included in the beneficent designs of God. He finds that similar opinions were freely entertained in the primitive church; he believes that they will rather purify than peril faith in the supernatural, and that therefore they will help to defend the eternal Gospel. The dissertation itself is eloquently and ably written, it displays a very extensive knowledge of facts, and most perfect command of them, and although in a tone of unfaltering independence, it is pervaded by the spirit of true reverence and faith. After a general introduction, the author advances to consider the indications of a preparation for Christianity in oriental paganism, including the religions of Western Asia, Egypt, Persia, India, the Pelasgic mythology, Hellenic humanism, and Greek philosophy to the time of Alexander. The second part is devoted to Greco-Roman paganism, the transformation of ancient paganism from the time of Alexander, and under the Roman domination. Here beginning with Greece under Alexander and his successors, he passes on to Rome before and after the conquest of Greece, and the Greco-Roman world. Under this last head he traces universal decline and universal aspiration. We next come to Judaism, its period of formation and of decline, followed by a concluding chapter on Christianity. This very brief indication will shew the extent and limits of the survey, and without at all pledging

ourselves to many of its ideas, we can attest the excellence and striking character of treatment. If Dr. de Pressensé sometimes goes too far, it may be, we are prone to fall short. His liberality is not greater than our conservatism, and we shall be glad if his book induces men of thoughtful minds to escape somewhat from a conventionalism, which has its trammels if it has its safeguards.

The translation is not always free from Gallicisms, and is disfigured by numerous errors in the spelling of ancient names. It is nevertheless very readable on the whole, and such as have not or cannot read the French original may accept it as a fair representation of an exquisitely written dissertation. We must observe too that the English version is well printed, and has an alphabetical index.

New Wine in Old Bottles. By the Rev. J. B. HEARD, A.M. London: Hatchard and Co.

THE ingenious author of this little book has disguised its real significance under a somewhat eccentric title. It properly belongs to the series of replies to *Essays and Reviews*, inasmuch as it was called forth by that volume, and is very much an answer to it. The matter was originally published in a London newspaper—the *Compass*, which no longer exists. Mr. Heard himself calls attention in his preface to one or two of the leading features of his essays. He observes: “The question of inspiration, which lies at the root of all the attacks of German rationalism, led me to consider the way in which the Church of the first four centuries waged a similar controversy about the person of our Lord, both God and man. I do not know of anything in English theology beyond a passing comparison between the nature of Scripture, human and divine, and that of our blessed Lord. I am told that a writer in the *Studien und Kritiken* has already traced out this analogy, and I should have been surprised if some German divine had not already anticipated me in drawing this parallel. In such researches we are to the Germans what the Greeks were to the Egyptians, always children. But I am not therefore deterred from tracing out this analogy, which is new to myself, and which is probably new to the majority of my readers. All I have attempted to do is to set forth some of the principal stages of the one controversy, and to point out the similar stages through which the other will probably run.” We thoroughly join in the author’s wish for a sound theory of inspiration; although we feel assured that the right idea of inspiration is entertained by many. What is wanted is that the idea should be properly developed and expounded. Mr. Heard thinks that the way of analogy is the one which must be pursued, and that a theory on this principle “elaborately wrought out, would meet all the demands both of reason and faith in the study of the Scriptures, and go far to reconcile the humanitarian and the orthodox schools, now so painfully divided on this question.” The reconciliation will, we fear, not soon be brought about, but of this we are sure that a judicious, honest and scholar-like book, one which should deal with facts, and take the Bible itself as a guide, would be of immense

service on this question of inspiration. The advocates of a mechanical theory on the one hand, and of a purely negative theory on the other, are not only a long way asunder, but probably both alike in error. Men may believe more than is true, as well as less than is true. The problem is to determine the extent and the relations of the human and the divine in that book which we call the Word of God.

Mr. Heard has great command of language, and as he has a lively imagination, quick wit, and a ready memory, he writes attractively, vigorously, and agreeably. He is evidently a well read and thoughtful man, earnest in the pursuit and defence of the truth. His chief fault is a tendency to diffuseness, and a little too much confidence in some of his assaults, otherwise the book is a pleasant and instructive one.

The Reformers; and the Theology of the Reformation. By the late W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THE name of Principal Cunningham needs no introduction on this side the Tweed, and it will be sufficient to recommend the volume now before us. This volume has been edited by his literary executors, who present this as the first instalment of their honourable labours. It is made up of a number of articles contributed by Dr. Cunningham to the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, with a few additions from his manuscript lectures on Church history. The articles themselves are based upon academical lectures, but they comprise a plan, and were intended for separate publication. The idea seems to have been to depict the leading historical characters of the Reformation, and to supply a well-considered estimate of the great developments of scriptural truth which were witnessed at that period. The editors have revised their copy, but appear to have done this with judgment and fidelity. We are greatly satisfied with the way in which they have done their work, and we hope the public will shew their appreciation of it. The articles are eleven in number, and we will state their subjects in the order in which they occur. The leaders of the Reformation; Luther; the Reformers and the doctrine of assurance; Melancthon and the theology of the Church of England; Zwingli and the doctrine of the sacraments; John Calvin; Calvin and Beza; Calvinism and Arminianism; Calvinism and the doctrine of philosophical necessity; Calvinism and its practical application; the Reformers and the lessons from their history. These are a magnificent set of themes, and they are wrought out with much learning, talent, fidelity, and Christian principle. It may be that all who read will not take the same view of every church question and doctrinal topic as Dr. Cunningham, but all will admit the power, earnestness, and living interest which almost every page exhibits. As a Presbyterian and a Calvinist, he expresses himself in a favourable or a friendly manner upon some points where we should not agree with him; but there are few things in this volume which can justly cause offence. Even where the conclusions arrived at may be thought too much influenced by the writer's partiality, there is commonly a fair amount of inge-

nious argument or probable fact in their favour. The tone is necessarily decidedly evangelical, and everywhere there is that reverence for the Holy Scriptures, and that acquiescence in their authority, which betoken a living faith. Few men in our day have probably appreciated better and understood more thoroughly the men about whom we here read; and certainly *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* has had nothing superior to these articles in point of learning and of power. Great problems are discussed in some of them, with an ability which will make them of permanent value. This value they cannot but have to such as investigate the same problems, whether from the same or from a different point of view. Such as take the same views will be instructed and fortified by what they here read. Such as take different ground will be instructed too, for they may see what others really think, and how they defend and explain the opinions they hold.

Thoughts on Holy Scripture. By FRANCIS BACON. Compiled by JOHN G. HALL. With Preface by JOHN CAIRNS, D.D. Edinburgh: Oliphant and Co.

To praise what Lord Bacon thought good to write would be affectation, we therefore simply say that the great philosopher wrote what is here printed. Mr. Hall is an American pastor, and he conceived the idea, here carried out, of extracting from Bacon's works passages in which texts of Scripture were commented upon. As we all know, such passages are numerous, and it is easy to see that if judiciously selected and arranged, they might make a useful volume. Mr. Hall's plan is simply to follow the Biblical books, from Genesis to Revelation. The only alteration made in this edition is that "a somewhat florid sketch of Bacon's life, as less suited to the scope of the work, has been considerably abridged." Dr. Cairns has written a very judicious and sensible preface, which all will do well to read, who read the book. For the rest, we need say but little. The difficulty of executing the work must have been very considerable, but as far as we can judge the task has been successfully accomplished to the extent it goes. An index supplies the title of the work from which each quotation is made; and another furnishes a list of the leading topics. The following are words which deserve reflection, touching as they do some of the great questions of our times. "Sacred theology (which in our idiom we call divinity) is grounded only upon the Word and oracle of God, and not upon the light of nature: for it is written, 'The heavens declare the glory of God;' but it is not written, 'The heavens declare the will of God.' But of that it said, 'To the law and testimony; if they speak not according to that Word, it is because there is no light in them.' This holdeth not only in those points of faith which concern the great mysteries of the Deity, of the creation, of the redemption, but likewise those which concern the law moral truly interpreted: love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; be like to your heavenly Father, that suffereth his rain to fall upon the just and un-

just. To this it ought to be applauded, 'The voice sounds not like human:' it is a voice beyond the light of nature.—In divinity, the more you recede from the Scriptures by inferences and consequences, the more weak and dilute are your positions." We cordially recommend the book.

An Essay on the Age and Antiquity of the Book of Nabathæan Agriculture. To which is added, an Inaugural Lecture on the Position of the Shemitic nations in the history of civilization. By M. ERNEST RENAN. London: Trübner and Co. 1862.

FOR two or three reasons we need not notice this translation at length, although the same reasons might prompt us to invite especial attention to it. In our number for April there appeared an article on the subject of M. Renan's essay upon the Nabateans, and their literature as it is supposed to have been exhumed by Professor Chwolson. Our present number also contains a notice of some of the views advanced by M. Renan. For the sake of those who wish to hear more upon both subjects we commend the little work before us. We all know that Renan is a genius, a scholar of the most varied attainments, a brilliant and sprightly writer, indefatigable in his exertions, and respected by his friends and foes alike for his many estimable qualities. But it is deeply to be deplored that such a man should be tempted to embrace a system of mere naturalism, that he should repudiate the supernatural element in religion, and only patronize popular forms of worship from artistic and political motives. The fact is, that he stands almost in the same relation to Christianity as the pagan philosophers of the early centuries did to heathenism: he considers religion a very good thing for the *profanum vulgus*, whom it helps to amuse, to interest, or to control, but it is not necessary for the wise. So then philosophers can do without that which is consonant with the universal instincts and aspirations of humanity. M. Renan is not likely to find favour among either Jews or Christians on the score of his philosophico-theological creed. We read his essay on Shemitic civilization with painful interest, and we hope those who are called by their office to spread or to defend the doctrines of divine revelation will read it too. It will acquaint them, in the language of one of their most candid and amiable, and yet most fearless, opponents, with the tremendous character of that invasion of negative principles which is doing so much mischief even among men of taste and learning. As we have said, however, we do not now review the book before us, but strongly recommend our readers to peruse it.

The complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D. Edited with Memoir by the Rev. A. B. GROSART. Vol. II. Edinburgh: James Nichols. 1862.

As soon as the complete works of Dr. Sibbes' works are before us, we shall notice them at greater length. At present we have but two words

to say. In the first place we wish to recommend most cordially the series of Puritan divines to which this volume belongs. Mr. Nichols deserves all possible praise for the courage and enterprize which have prompted him to undertake the republication of the writings of some of those great divines who adorned the Church of England early in the seventeenth century. He has by this project embarked in an enterprize of no small magnitude and importance. He will, perhaps, surprise some who have been content with the shallow and insipid effusions of certain recent writers, by exhibiting to them writers whose profound piety, enlarged hearts, and well-balanced intellects render them worthy of the admiration of all ages. It is too much the fashion to decry the Puritans, but this is the result of ignorance. Those who would know what they were may read the volumes issued by Mr. Nichols; and they will no longer class them with narrow-souled, wry-faced bigots, the fanatics or the scoundrels who wore religion as a cloak. They will see that the true Puritans were a worthy race of men, who enjoyed the ministration of laborious and faithful clergymen. It is true that we do not always approve of what they did and said, and we may smile sometimes at the quaint and rude words they used. But after all we cannot read such works as those of Goodwin, Adams, Sibbes, and the rest of this series, and not see that we have much to learn from them.

Our second remark applies to this volume in particular,—the first has not reached us, so we cannot speak of that. Mr. Grosart seems to us to be a competent editor who loves and honours, almost reverences his author. We are glad that Dr. Sibbes has fallen into his hands. The volume before us contains a course of sermons upon the Song of Solomon, rather eccentrically styled, "Bowels opened." A second course of sermons is on Hosea xiv., "The returning Backslider." A third series of sermons on Isaiah xxv. 6—9, is, "The glorious feast of the Gospel." We cannot say that Dr. Sibbes is always eloquent or elegant, but he is always full and strong. We cannot read a page without being struck with the exuberance of thought and illustration, and it is easy to see that we have fallen among the mighty ones of the church of Bishops Andrewes, Hall, and the like.

A Grammar of the Arabic Language. Translated from the German of CASPARI, and edited, with numerous additions and corrections, by WILLIAM WRIGHT. Vol. II. London: Williams and Norgate.

THE first volume of Mr. Wright's version of Caspari's grammar appeared in 1859, and in the volume before us we are happy to announce its completion. The work is rather founded on Caspari's than translated from it, and as such deserves to be more than mentioned. In the former volume we had the orthography and etymology, and in this we have the syntax and prosody. To review a work of this description would require a considerable space; we shall, therefore, not profess to more than indicate its character and value. Under the head of "the verb," we are presented with minute, and yet lucid, explanations of the various uses of the verb, its tenses and moods, without and with

prepositions. The noun follows, and its uses and government are not only stated, but illustrated by many apposite examples. Next comes the structure of sentences, where the different forms in which they appear are fully described. Last of all there is a section devoted to prosody, a very appropriate addition, and one which the Arabic student will do well to master. The book is supplied with an index of Arabic words and technical terms, and another index of English and Latin technical terms, grammatical forms, constructions, etc. Our readers will see that the plan is comprehensive and satisfactory, and we can assure them that the execution is highly commendable. Mr. Wright has the reputation of being one of our best Arabic scholars, and in his anxiety to promote and facilitate the study of the language, he has undertaken the preparation of a work by which he has earned the gratitude of students. He may not have succeeded in making Arabic easy; its grammar is too complicated, and its lexicon too rich for it ever to be made easy, but he has removed great difficulties out of the way, he has set forth its principles in intelligible English, he has compared it in many of its features with other Shemitic tongues, and he has arranged its rules in such a manner, that any one who deserves to be a student will be able to find, understand, and apply them; Mr. Wright has the virtue of knowing, that not a dissertation upon every rule is required, but a simple statement, nor has he failed to give under each rule such a collection of examples, that its force is at once apparent. On the whole, we have real satisfaction in announcing the completion of this eminently useful book. We think the student will soon perceive that it is not only admirably edited, but accurately printed.

Our German Brethren, especially the German Evangelical Church in North America, from a personal survey. By LIC. G. MELLIN. Berlin: Wiegandt and Grieben. 1862.

THE Germans are yearly carrying their plodding industry, their learning and religious zeal, to North America. The number of German emigrants is increasing at a great ratio, and yet, such is the influence of the strong and rapid tide of American life, that they are in some danger of losing the distinctive features of their nationality and religion. In Pennsylvania even the children are ashamed of being reproached as *Dutchmen*, and American schools, on account of the better support given them, are preferred by German parents. In the east of the States there is more wealth and independence among the Germans (who are very numerous in New York, numbering one hundred and fifty thousand in the city alone) than in the west, where the infant community has to contend with many difficulties besides that of the confessional. The Lutherans are the most tenacious of their language and customs, and are more connected with the reformers than with any other body. They have the same German Bible, Hymn Book and Book of Devotion.

The German Evangelical Church, in the West, needs the support of

its continental brethren, although the energy of some of its pastors, and the zeal and self-devotion of the members, have overcome many difficulties. The reformed and Lutheran churches are not on such terms of alliance as farther east, and the common enemy, infidelity, makes strenuous efforts by means of secret societies, Sunday amusements, newspapers and journals. Many of the pastors are poorly educated, being by origin missionaries, and being unrecognized, they are obliged to form little communities, or synods, of their own. There is a college of three years' standing, and a theological seminary of about twelve, seventeen English miles N.W. of St. Louis. There are also an hospital and orphan house there. The number of students at the college is from sixteen to twenty sons of labourers and mechanics in the neighbourhood. Great attention is paid to the Hebrew of the Old and the Greek of the New Testament. There is much that is hopeful in this state of things, and the world in general will be re-invigorated by sympathizing with the zealous and hardy pioneers of religion and civilization in the far West. † †

A compendious Introduction to the Study of the Bible. Originally written by the late Rev. T. H. HORNE, B.D., and now revised and edited by the Rev. JOHN AYRE, M.A. Tenth Edition. London: Longmans.

THE first book we ever read on Biblical literature and criticism was Mr. Horne's compendious introduction, a work which in its day rendered good service to many. There is no doubt, however, that there was need for something which represented more nearly the present state of sacred learning, and we have earnestly desired to see an edition of the introduction similar to the one before us. Mr. Ayre has endeavoured to produce an analysis or summary of the larger work, which he has kept constantly before him, and the order of which he has mainly followed. The volume is necessarily concise; so vast a number of topics could be treated only in the briefest manner, and so as to direct rather than to satisfy inquiry. It is in fact an introduction and nothing more. But it is a book which will give the student some idea of the field before him, and will therefore prepare him for the more extended research which he will feel to be necessary. The original author was an eminently useful writer, and his idea of a popular introduction to Biblical studies was a very happy one. The value of his work has been tested by the experience of five and thirty years, and after so much service it may be superseded with the conviction that it has not been in vain. The present is to all intents and purposes a new book. Part I. treats of the genuineness, authenticity, inspiration, etc., of the Holy Scriptures; part II., of the criticism and interpretation of Scripture; part III., of Biblical geography and antiquities; part IV., of each separate canonical book, with a chapter on the Apocrypha. An appendix is added containing tables and indexes. The volume contains three maps and a few engravings. Altogether it is a very compact affair, and we believe that there are many to whom it will be a positive boon. Young

men, clergymen with but little leisure, and others similarly situated, as Sunday-school teachers and lay agents, will do well to procure the book. For the great mass of ordinary readers it will be found sufficient; and we shall be surprised if, in its remodelled and improved form, it is not even more popular than its predecessor.

The British Jews ; their religious ceremonies, social condition, domestic habits, literature, political statistics, etc. By the Rev. J. MILLS, F.R.A.S. London : Houlston and Wright.

THIS work, on its first appearance, was warmly and justly commended by the public press. We can but reiterate the opinion we then expressed, that it supplies a desideratum in our literature, and that the accuracy and variety of its information renders its perusal not only desirable, but necessary, for those who wish to become acquainted with the British Jews. It is judiciously limited to the Jews of our own country, and respecting them, it teaches us much that we could not elsewhere learn. The fact is, we know very little of the Jews except that they keep the seventh day sabbath, abstain from certain meats, keep certain festivals, and practice circumcision. There is a belief that their prayers and Scriptures are in Hebrew, and that their priests are called rabbis. But who knows anything of the *Mohel*, the *Sandak*, the *Chazan*, and the *Bar Mitzvah*? Of their peculiar habits, religious rites, social status, literature, bonds of association, numbers, etc., few among us know anything. Mr. Mills disperses our darkness, or at any rate makes our ignorance voluntary. His book is divided into three parts, describing at length the domestic habits of the Jews, their religion, and their social condition. They are among us but not of us, a thousand things divide them from us by a deep gulf, yet they are of us in that they are faithful and industrious citizens, are many of them liberal and generous patrons of all that is good, and the friends and promoters of intelligence and learning. Mr. Mills draws his statements from the fountain head; he has been among the people, and from themselves he has learned what he tells us. He writes simply as a narrator and describer; he is friendly disposed to the Jews, but he has no party purpose to serve, and hence there is an absence of that feeling which is apt to appear where such is the case, or where there is a theory to maintain. Our readers may easily verify the truth of our remarks, and will not regret the five shillings the book costs them.

Catechesis Evangelica ; being Questions and Answers based on the "Textus Receptus." For the use of theological students. Part I., St. Matthew. By THOMAS LAW MONTEFIORE, M.A. London : Longmans.

THIS is the first of a series intended to enable students of the New Testament to collect valuable criticism in a short time, and also to induce a further search into the mines of theological wealth. The first chapter is introductory, and contains answers to something like forty

questions as to the character, literature, divisions, etc., of the New Testament. A fund of useful information is here condensed into a small space, and yet set forth simply and clearly. It comprises in a few pages all the leading facts included in works upon the New Testament in general. The next chapter is introductory to St. Matthew's Gospel, the notes upon which follow. These notes are drawn up in the form of question and answer, and they are made the vehicle of calling attention to many points of interest, as well as the means of conveying much useful information. They embody a number of appropriate verbal criticisms, and a considerable amount of illustration relating to historical and divers other matters. The author has not merely endeavoured to assist the translator, but to inform the reader. As to the manner in which this task has been executed, we give it our unreserved approval, without, however, pledging ourselves to every explanation offered. After the notes comes an appendix preceded by facsimiles of some ancient manuscripts. The appendix itself is a collection of extracts, etc., which could hardly be introduced elsewhere. They are: on ancient manuscripts; list of Greek uncials of the New Testament; descriptions of Codices A, B, C, D; list of ancient versions and critical editions; accounts of the Septuagint and Vulgate, and a note on Matt. i. 12. For students, private persons, and teachers, this little work is every way adapted, and we wish it success.

Joseph and his Brethren. "Which things are an allegory." By
REGINALD COURTENAY, D.D., Bishop of Kingston, Jamaica.
London: Hatchard and Co.

THERE can be no question as to the piety of this book, and its doctrine is unmistakeably evangelical. Bishop Courtenay is of opinion that the love of God in Christ was prefigured in the history of Joseph and his brethren; and that this history affords a greater variety of incidents signally prefiguring the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, than can be found in the lives of any other group of personages, or of any individual named in Scripture—even of those whom the revelation itself designates as types of the promised Messiah. This is high ground to take, and ground which, if it could be maintained, would justify us in seeing a type or prophecy in every part of the Old Testament, which is analogous to something in the New. But it is a serious question how far this is to be carried. Some among us, proceeding on principles not dissimilar, have found in the records of the New Testament prophecies of events to occur to the end of the world. The miracles and the parables of our Lord, for example, have been treated in this way. Bishop Courtenay finds parallels enough for his purpose. The false accusation of Joseph and his imprisonment is viewed as a type of the false accusation brought against our Lord when he was condemned. Even our Saviour's saying to the woman of Canaan is viewed as a fulfilment of Joseph's harsh treatment of his brethren. And so of the rest. We regret that a book in so excellent a spirit should not be based on sounder principles of interpretation; for we

must hold, that types are one thing, and that mere casual resemblances are quite another.

The Works of Thomas Adams ; being the sum of his sermons, meditations, and other divine and moral discourses, with Memoir. By JOSEPH ANGUS, D.D. Vol. III., containing sermons from texts in the New Testament, and meditations on the Creed. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

THIS volume contains the memoir and the sermons, etc., referred to in the title page. Besides which, a separate section with distinct pagination gives us sermons and treatises by Samuel Ward, B.D., once fellow of Sidney Sussex College and preacher at Ipswich; from the edition of 1636, edited by Rev. J. C. Ryle, B.A., with a brief memoir. We have already described this series as a marvellous combination of cheapness and excellence, and we can only reiterate the statement. There are very few things which we should wish to see altered, and what they are we shall say at once. We wish the obsolete words had all been retained, and explained in the margin: we wish that the prefaces and dedications had not been removed from their original position, and that a little more attention had been paid to the Latin quotations. The obsolete expressions retained and explained are not all correctly explained; for instance "crossrow," p. 93, is explained in a note by the editor, "the multiplication table;" whereas it is the alphabet, as the next sentence ought to have suggested. So Shakspeare,

"He hearkens after prophecies and dreams,
And from the *cross-row* plucks the letter *g*;
And says the wizard told him that by *g*
His issue disinherited should be."

At p. 55 also, "blee" is explained to mean "blow or bloom," whereas it signifies colour, or complexion. Hence in the old play of "George a Green,"

"To see fair Bettriss how bright she is of *blee*."

Again, at p. 63, "amated" is explained by "mated," but it means perplexed.

The general reader will find many curious things in Adams, and to the theologian, his works are of great value. Of his companion in this volume, we have not much to say. Not much is known of him; his works are few, and very rare, but evidencing great piety and ability.

Congregational Church History from the Reformation to 1662. By JOHN WADDINGTON, D.D.

Christian Churches : the noblest form of social life ; the representatives of Christ on earth ; the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit. By JOSEPH ANGUS, D.D. London: Ward and Co. 1862.

THESE are "Bicentenary Prize Essays," written in pursuance of an invitation issued by the Congregational Union at Birmingham, in

October, 1861. Dr. Waddington has evidently taken much pains to collect the facts which he has wrought up in his essay. He says that "an essay from the pen of Luther appeared in 1523 entitled, 'Causes and Reasons deduced from the Scriptures, why a Christian Congregation have the right and power to judge over, to call, to appoint, and remove their teachers,' in which he asserts the independence of the separate church in terms the most unqualified." He first finds the Congregational polity exemplified in England about three centuries since, so that the history covers a century. Our author is a very decided Independent, but for the facts it contains we may safely recommend his well compiled summary to such as wish to become acquainted with the origins of Independency as related by one who has long studied the subject.

Dr. Angus has produced a very well written essay, but it relates to a class of questions which we cannot admit the discussion of. The author treats of the nature, discipline, and government of the church, according to the principles of Congregationalism. The acceptance of this and the preceding essay in some sense gives them the character of official documents. Dr. Waddington and Dr. Angus may be fairly considered as the authorized exponents of the history and church principles of the Congregationalists.

Messiah as foretold and expected. A course of Sermons on the prophecies of the Messiah; as interpreted by the Jews before the coming of Christ. By E. HAROLD BROWNE, B.D. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1862.

THESE four sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge by the Norrisian professor of divinity, deserve attention for the sake of the place, the preacher, and the subject. The titles of the sermons are, Israelites waiting for the Kingdom, from Acts x. 43; The Forerunner and the Judgment, from Mal. iii. 1, 2; The Incarnation and the Nativity, from Micha v. 2; The Passion and the Atonement, from Isa. lii. 3—6. The intention of these sermons, as stated in the title, is to exhibit the Messianic interpretation of various passages in the Old Testament as understood by the older Jews. It is well known to the students of Jewish literature, that many places in the Targums, etc., make distinct allusions to the Messiah, but perhaps general readers are not at all aware of the number of passages which once received this Messianic interpretation from the Jewish writers. In course of time, when the expectations of the Jews were disappointed, and when the Christians began to make the same applications of certain texts, the rabbins endeavoured to put a different construction upon them, and applied them no longer to the Messiah. Mr. Browne has furnished many curious illustrations of these Messianic interpretations, and his volume is well fitted to shew that the Christian Church did not invent, but merely adopted the Messianic application, which had been long current among the Jews. The book is a very interesting and instructive one.

Sermons on Popular Subjects, preached in the Collegiate Church, Wolverhampton. By JULIUS LLOYD, M.A. London: Bell & Daldy.

THESE sermons are strictly what they profess to be—*ad populum*, and on subjects of universal interest. There is about them an air of simplicity, earnestness and piety, which admirably befits their practical tendency and design. The discourses are twelve in number, and the topics are, Sunday Labour, Sickness, Happiness, Children, Business, Mammon, Peace and War, The Tongue, Education, Christmas and New Year. We want more of this kind of preaching. Christianity is meant for our daily life, and the preacher of the Gospel seldom brings a more wise and gracious message than when he tells men how to live, and encourages and comforts them amid the duties of life. There are other and, some may say, higher themes, but we are satisfied that the preacher is well employed who instructs his flock how to adorn the Gospel in all things. Mr. Lloyd has our best thanks for these sermons; they are well deserving of study as examples of pastoral discourses. Amid the thousand and one doctrinal and other purely theological themes which invite the minister of God's holy Word, it is well sometimes to find a place for topics such as these. The eighth sermon, on Peace and War, is an exceptional subject, but judiciously handled.

A Treatise on the Grammar of the New Testament, embracing observations on the literal interpretation of numerous passages. A New Edition. By the Rev. THOMAS SHELDON GREEN, M.A. London: S. Bagster and Sons.

SEVERAL changes have been introduced by Mr. Green into this edition of his useful work. A new arrangement has been adopted, many portions have been re-cast, and other alterations have been made. The character of this book is doubtless known to most of our readers, but if any of them are unacquainted with it, we cannot serve them better than by saying what it is. First there is an introduction, comprising observations on the Greek of the New Testament as viewed in its relation to the Greek of classic writers. The opening chapter is on the origin and nature of the New Testament Greek. In succeeding chapters enquiries are instituted in regard to the article, the substantive, adjective, pronoun, and verb, after which come chapters on negative particles, prepositions, etc. The last chapter is on the grammatical structure of sentences. An index of texts concludes the whole. The character of the work is to be seen at a glance. It is not a grammar, but it illustrates the grammatical forms and idioms of the New Testament. Observations and explanations are accompanied by examples from the Greek Testament, and sometimes from the classics. The book is intelligently and intelligibly written, and is one which will be very servicable to readers of the New Testament in Greek. We have pleasure in calling attention to it, and hope it may be increasingly useful in promoting the better understanding of the sacred volume to the elucidation of which it is devoted.

A Paraphrase of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah. By J. C. WHISH. With notes from various sources. London: Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday.

It has long been our wish to see the idea of this book carried out; we are therefore glad to see an effort made to do what, we are persuaded, will greatly tend, when well done, to facilitate the understanding of the Scriptures. The Rev. Mr. Whish has taken the book of Isaiah, and sought by slightly altering, paraphrasing, or abridging the English version, to make it more intelligible. In addition to this, he has bestowed considerable attention upon the arrangement and divisions, so that while the old notation is preserved, a new appearance is given to the sections. The subject of each of these sections is also indicated. Throughout the volume, brief notes and references to authorities are added in the margin, for the illustration or confirmation of the text. Mr. Whish adopts the orthodox view as to the Messianic character of many passages, although his renderings are not always the more common ones. Thus, in ix. 6, he adopts the translation "possessor of eternity" for the "everlasting Father" of the authorized version. We are not sure that he is always right, but he has acted judiciously, and produced a book which deserves the attention both of the scholar and the ordinary reader.

Soundings of Antiquity: a new method of applying the astronomical evidences to the events of history, and an assignment of true dates to the epochs of the Church. By the Rev. H. M. GROVER. London: Rivingtons.

MR. GROVER is a diligent and ingenious writer, and much that he has published is curious and novel. His object here is to explain what has appeared to himself "a very simple and sure method of measuring the intervals of historical time, and testing the dates of past events, in all cases where they can in any way be associated with a known 'status' of the age and ecliptic position of the moon at the periods referred to." He believes that his method is simple almost beyond belief, and perfectly certain in its determinations. The method in question is explained and applied. Errors are found in the computations hitherto received, a more certain principle is proposed, and certain important dates, are, it is thought, determined. We shall not examine the processes here worked out, but we mention the pamphlet in the hope that chronological students may be induced to scrutinize it, and to see what they can learn from it. The principal calculation is to shew that our Lord's death took place on March 25, 1831 years since, so that if he were thirty-one years and three months old at that time, we are in A.D. 1863.

A Sermon of Doctor Martin Luther, on the Nativity of Christ. London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt.

THIS sermon is a reprint, extracted from a volume of Luther's discourses "Englised by W. Gage," and published in London in 1578.

The title and contents of the whole volume are given, but as there is no editorial note of any kind, we are at a loss to discover whether it is intended to reprint them all, or whether this is designed as a specimen. The text is Luke ii. 1—14, and Luther preaches upon this passage a wholesome discourse, in which he exhibits the sum of the text, and the exposition of the text. It will be read with some interest as a representation of the mode of preaching which the great reformer adopted, and of the views he propounded on some important facts and truths of Christianity. We cannot say that it is exactly the model which we should recommend for adoption by the preachers of the present day, although it has some qualities which we could wish were more common.

Die Hellenistischen, besonders Alexandrinischen und sonst Schwierigen Verbalformen im Griechischen Neuen Testaments, für Schulen und dem Selbstunterricht, etc. Von Dr. S. C. SCHIRLITZ. Erfurt: F. W. Otto. 1862.

THIS little book is an alphabetically arranged list of the more difficult forms of verbs to be found in the New Testament. The forms are grammatically explained, so that the novice can see at a glance what they are. We are not sure that we do not prefer the old practice followed in some editions of the Greek Testament, where the forms to be looked for in the lexicon are printed in the margin. Still, a book of this sort has its advantages, because it supplies at once the information required, and can be used with any edition of the Greek Testament. We know not that we can better explain the plan of the book than by translating a single example, and we take the first our eye lights upon:—“Ἐληλακότες, particip., 1 perf. act. plu., from ἐλαύνω, whose unused root from ἐλάω assumes an ν in the present, and lengthens the preceding vowel (see Buttmann's Gr., § 112, 10); hence in fut. ἐλάσω, in 1 aor. act. ἤλασα, and in perf. act. with the Attic reduplication (see Buttmann's Gr., § 85, rem. 2), ἐλήλακα, in part. ἐληλακώς, ἐληλακότος, etc.; John vi. 9.” Besides the references to Buttmann, there are others to Tischendorf's Greek Testament, to a work on New Testament Greek by our author, etc.

Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. From the German of J. J. VAN OSTERZEE, D.D. Edited by J. P. LANGE, D.D. Translated by SOPHIA TAYLOR. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

MESSRS. CLARK intended to issue the third volume of Lange on Matthew, but circumstances have prevented them for a time. In the meanwhile they give their subscribers a volume of a Commentary on Luke's Gospel by a Rotterdam divine, Dr. Osterzee. This volume was produced in furtherance of Lange's plan, and forms a valuable member of the Theological and Homiletical Commentary, of which he is editor as well as projector. As the title indicates, the book is specially

designed and adapted for the use of ministers and students. It will be valuable for much of its original criticism, and also for the many allusions it makes to authors who have either written upon the same Gospel, or have supplied illustrations of topics adverted to by St. Luke or our critic. The text of the Gospel is given in sections, and each division is supplied with critical notes, doctrinal reflections, and homiletical hints. Such a work is what we wanted on this admirable Gospel, and we strongly commend it to the attention of the reader.

Last Day of our Lord's Passover. By REV. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D.
Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

THIS book comprises a narrative of all the incidents recorded in the Gospels of the last day of our blessed Saviour's life, from his arrest in the garden to his burial in the sepulchre. Its form is that of lectures or homilies, and therefore simple and practical. The author has taken pains to ascertain the true nature and bearings of the facts upon which he discourses, but he gives us none of the critical processes which have preceded his conclusions. This is well. We want books which are not merely critical, but speak from the heart of the author to our own heart. Of this we are growingly conscious. It is a noticeable fact too, that where a book is purely critical, and as such only exhibits the intellectual and rational side of religion, it is seldom popular: whereas a book in a devout spirit, and free from technicalities of style and manner, is very likely to be much sought after. The reason is, that that which is addressed to learned and intellectual readers necessarily appeals to the minority. All men have hearts, but not all have well furnished and disciplined minds. Dr. Hanna has hit upon an interesting subject; he has handled it well, and his book ought to be a favourite with Christians. Three editions in as many months augur well for its popularity.

The Mission and extension of the Church at home, considered in eight lectures preached before the University of Oxford. By JOHN SANDFORD, B.D. London: Longmans.

THIS is the Bampton Lecture for 1861, and Archdeacon Sandford may hope for it a place by the side of the most useful of the series. It contains so many valuable practical suggestions, so many wise reflections, and so many judiciously chosen facts, that we regret it does not come within our domain to give it an extended notice. We can simply say what are the topics of the lectures, and that they are followed by a copious body of important notes. The first lecture is on the nature and office of the Church; the 2nd, distinctive features of the English Church; the 3rd, Hindrances of the Church; 4th, Wants of the Church; 5th, Clerical agency; 6th, National education as subsidiary to the Church; 7th, Fabrics and services of the Church; 8th, The Church as it was, as it is, and as it might be. Let our clerical readers by all means study this volume.

Libri Judicum et Ruth secundum versionem Syriaco-Hexaplarem, quos ex codice Musei Britannici nunc primum edidit, Græce restituit notisque criticis illustravit. Dr. T. SKAT RÖRDAM. Præmittitur dissertatio de regulis grammaticis, quas secutus est Paulus Tellensis in Veteri Testamento ex Græco Syriace vertendo. Havniæ: Schwartz.

THE existence of these books in the British Museum has for some time been known, and the editor has rendered a good service to Biblical literature by publishing them. The version to which they belong is from the Septuagint, and really forms the Old Testament portion of the so-called Philoxenian version. Both were executed at the same time, or nearly so, viz., a little before A.D. 620; and both were produced at Alexandria. The Syriac Hexaplar is of course chiefly valuable for the study of the Septuagint, and it contributes some important items for the settlement of its readings. Dr. Rördam's preface is an instructive one, and one which does him much credit. He has printed the Syriac and Greek in parallel columns; altered the Greek to make it agree with the Syriac; and added critical notes. His work is remarkably well done.

L'Avenir de l'Eglise Grecque-unie. Par le R. P. J. GAGARIN, de la Compagnie de Jesus. Paris: Douniol.

M. GAGARIN commences by rapidly tracing the origin of the distinction between the Greek and Latin churches, and he then describes the growth and actual state of the united Greek community. He admits that the united Greeks are feeble, and in other ways in an undesirable condition, but he thinks that their revival would tend to bring back the Greek church to its original unity with the Latin. To revive the united Greek church, he thinks it needful to begin with the priesthood, and to promote their more thorough preparation for their work. A great seminary would be the best means of improving the priesthood. We can readily understand the anxiety which is manifest in certain directions to propagate the principles of the Romish church in the east. We cannot blame this anxiety, and we readily call attention to M. Gagarin's pamphlet, because it presents us with the views of an intelligent man upon a subject which we should not lose sight of.

An Essay on the Angels of the Churches: Revelation ii., iii. By the Rev. GEORGE HOLDEN, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

THIS little book is intended to ascertain what the angels of the churches were to whom the Apocalyptic epistles were addressed. The author shews that they were not literally angels, and that some person or body of persons must be meant. Were the angels the churches themselves, or a presbytery, or consistory of elders? Mr. Holden thinks not; but that they were the chief pastors or bishops of the churches in question. He argues these points with intelligence and judgment, and no doubt is left in our minds, that whatever sense we attach to the word

bishops, the angels of the churches were bishops. Mr. Holden goes further than this, and seeks to discover proofs that these bishops were persons of considerable authority and responsibility. The argument is sometimes pushed a little too far, as in the use made of the words in Rev. iii. 9, "I will make them to come and worship before thy feet," freely quoted from Isaiah xlix. 23, or lx. 14. On critical grounds alone we notice and recommend the perusal of this essay.

Remarks on the grounds of Faith, suggested by Mr. Pattison's Essay on the tendencies of Religious Thought. By C. GOOCH, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co.

LIKE many others, Mr. Gooch has been turning his attention to the famous volume by the Oxford savants. We have permitted him to express his views on one of the essays in our number for July last, because we are fully persuaded that discussing these questions will exhibit the relative strength of parties, and tend to the development and confirmation of scriptural truth. Mr. Pattison's production relates to a period when all confess our theological literature and our spiritual life were in decadence. Amid all the greatness and goodness which meets us, we encounter much that is defective and disgraceful. If there were toleration, there was intolerance; if there were intellectual vigour, there was rationalism: if there were spiritual life, there was a cold and dead formality. We can never be sufficiently thankful that out of the miserable controversies and absurdities of the times there emerged a better and a purer era, and one which has not yet come to a close.

Remarks on Presbyterianism and Presbyterian Union in the Colonies. By a COLONIAL CHURCHMAN; with a preface by the Rev. NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D. Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons.

Dr. MACLEOD tells us what he knows of the author of this pamphlet, who he thinks is entitled to be heard with attention, as one who knows what he writes about. He also says, "I cannot help expressing my strong sympathy with the general views and proposals expressed in this pamphlet, though, of course, I do not thereby pledge myself to every opinion in its pages." The paper is in the form of a letter "to the members of the colonial committees of the church of Scotland, of the Free Church, and of the Board of Missions of the United Presbyterian Church." Its object is to expound the condition of Presbyterianism in the colonies, and to recommend such measures for combining and strengthening it, as the writer deems most proper for the purpose. It contains some useful information.

The Divine Footsteps in Human History. Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons.

THE anonymous author of this volume is, we may presume, a Scotchman of no small industry and ingenuity. His aim appears to be to map out human history, civil and ecclesiastical, and to shew that it is

the evolution of a regular divine plan. Special prominence is assigned to England and Scotland. Towards the end of the book a parallel is drawn between the history which has been sketched, and the fortieth chapter of Ezekiel. By this parallel it is shewn how the measurements, courts, chambers, etc., of the prophets, correspond with the history, and that they therefore are designed to foreshadow it. We have no great liking for speculations of this kind, but for the information of our readers we have indicated the character of the work before us. The author has had the pleasure of writing and publishing it, and this is probably nearly all he expected, for he must have been aware that there is very little demand for new theories of history and of Biblical interpretation.

Twelve Obscure Texts of Scripture, illustrated according to the Spiritual Sense. By MARY C. HUME. London: F. Pitman.

THE spiritual sense, according to Mrs. Hume, is the sense given to these texts by applying the rules of Swedenborg, whose peculiar principles led him to view every part of Scripture as allegorical or having a double meaning. It is well known that similar fanciful methods of interpretation have prevailed in all ages, but it was reserved for the Swedish philosopher to reduce them to system, and to ground upon them a theological scheme. Like most of her school, Mrs. Hume is very ingenious, but of course we consider such expositions as solemn trifles, though we may be counted profane for our opinion.

Corrections of the Copies of the Vatican MS. By HERMANN HEINFETTER. London: A. Heylin.

THIS is the most useful work which its amiable author has published. It is a collation of the collations of the Vatican New Testament, shewing where Birch agrees with Bentley or Mai, and where all three differ. It appears that the collators differ from each other in one thousand three hundred and three places; Mai differs from Birch in three hundred and ninety-five places; and Bentley from Birch in eight hundred and fifty-nine places. In forty-nine places they all disagree; the actual number of errors may be greater, as Birch has been taken as a standard. The chief fault of this book is that it includes some portions of the New Testament which are not in the Vatican MS. Its value would also have been greater if Birch had not been made a standard. But we accept it as a contribution to our knowledge of this celebrated text.

Constitutiones Apostolorum. P. A. DE LAGARDE edidit. Sumptibus Editoris; formis Teubnerianis. Berlin: B. G. Teubner. 1862.

OUR readers know Dr. De Lagarde very well as a laborious and careful editor of Greek and Syriac texts. For the purposes of his vocation, as we may style it, he has explored sundry of the public libraries of Europe, including our own. His industry is thoroughly German, and therefore very generous and disinterested. Although continually com-

plaining of poverty, and that his books are neither sold nor read, he still goes on editing a new volume every few months. We presume it is the love of his labour therefore which keeps him at it. In this edition of the Apostolical Constitutions he has given us a critical text based upon the best manuscripts and printed copies. He has appended some notes and many various readings, as well as an index of texts. The book is well printed, and may claim the place of an authority.

Liturgical Perplexities and Church difficulties arising from Rubrical discrepancies, considered with a view to their abatement or removal.
By WILLIAM PEACE. London: Partridge and Co.

MR. PEACE feels like many others in these anxious times, a desire to consider calmly and to remove, if possible, the differences of opinion which exist on Church matters. His book is divided into three parts: 1. Liturgical perplexities arising from rubrical discrepancies; 2. Revisions of the Prayer Book, alterations made in it, conduct of parties in 1661-2, and in 1689; 3. The opening of the Reformation in 1535 to the state of the Church in 1862,—opinions of several divines, etc. The book is written in a spirit befitting an author with such a name, but opinions are freely and fairly stated. As, however, the work is one which we cannot in these pages profess to criticize, we must be content to announce its appearance and its general character as a sober and intelligent statement of facts and sentiments.

A Literal Translation of the Vatican Manuscript's Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians; on definite rules of translation, and an English version, etc. By HERMANN HEINFETTER. London: A. Heylin.

THE Vatican MS. never had a more devoted student and admirer than Mr. Heinfetter, who has zealously laboured for years in his endeavours to translate and expound its New Testament text. Some of his remarks are judicious and useful, but we often feel called upon to differ from him, and always from his principles of translation.

A Treatise on the Resurrection. By PATON J. GLOAG. London: Wertheim, Macintosh and Hunt.

MR. GLOAG calls this a small contribution to theology, but it is a useful one. The subject is of importance, and it is here treated in a sound and sensible manner. The author animadverts upon various erroneous views of the resurrection, commencing with those of Mr. Maurice; we wish he had examined those of the Swedenborgians. In five chapters we have discussions on the reality of the resurrection, its possibility, the identity of our present and future bodies, the nature of the raised body, the time of the resurrection, and its importance. We would not endorse several of the opinions advanced by Mr. Gloag, but his book contains much that is judicious and instructive.

Instrumental Strength: Thoughts for Students and Pastors. By CHARLES STANFORD. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

WE gather from the preface, that Mr. Stanford delivered the substance of this address to the students of the Baptist College, Bristol. The author's tone is decidedly earnest, and his style lucid and energetic. Nothing is more appropriate for candidates for ministerial work than addresses which appeal to their consciences and hearts, as well as to their understandings. It would be well if such solemn exhortations were made general. From his particular standpoint, Mr. Stanford has spoken admirably.

Preachers and Preaching. A Critique, with practical hints. By a "DEAR HEARER." London: J. H. and Jas. Parker.

THIS pamphlet contains some sound and wholesome animadversions upon certain prevalent abuses. Probably many will think it severe beyond what is necessary. At the same time it is a pamphlet which all may read with profit, and it is evidently the production of a shrewd and observant man. No doubt there are many evils connected with modern preaching which ought to be corrected. Without approving of all that is here said, we must own that the pamphlet is suggestive as well as spirited.

Johannes Brentz. Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften. Von JULIUS HARTMANN. Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs.

THIS volume forms part of the *Lives and Select Writings of the Fathers and Founders of the Lutheran Church*. Brentz was a man of great talent, learning and activity, and his name is inseparably connected with the controversies and religious events of the sixteenth century. Herr Hartmann has produced a memoir of real interest and value, and his work will therefore deserve its place among the volumes which commemorate the Lutheran heroes of the Reformation. Every work which gives us a clearer insight into that period we cordially welcome, and for that reason we welcome this.

On the Reverence due to Holy Places and Holy Things. London: Masters.

THE editor of this little book intimates that it is an abridgement from the work of Dr. Markland, *On the Reverence due to Holy Places*. He believes that there is need for further improvement in this matter, and hopes that what is here said will have a tendency to warm our love and affection for everything which appertains to the service of God, or which has ever been devoted to Him. There is very much in these pages which is suggestive, instructive, and calculated to promote the end designed. We are inclined to think that our indifference to the matters here specified often savours of profanity, even when principle is urged in its defence.

The Papal Criminal History ; preceded by De Romanorum Religionis Origine, etc. By Dr. BEGGI. London, printed for the author. 1862.

ALTOGETHER this volume contains more than eight hundred and sixty pages, partly in Latin and partly in English ; partly historical and partly dogmatical, theological, etc. ; partly original and partly selected. It is difficult to see the bearing of much that is here said on papal criminal history ; and Dr. Beggi would have been more successful if he had rejected half his matter, and properly arranged the rest.

Incense for the Family Altar : being Morning and Evening Psalms and Hymns for two weeks, suited to domestic worship, and set to appropriate music, original and selected. Compiled by B. SCOTT, F.R.A.S. London : Longmans.

THE character of this very neatly got up book is sufficiently described by the title-page. The hymns are beautiful and mostly familiar ; the music is for the most part appropriate, though one or two of the tunes are not the best adapted for ordinary family use ; such in our opinion is " Alma."

An Examination of some portions of Dr. Lushington's judgment on the admission of the articles in the cases of the Bishop of Salisbury v. Williams, and Fendall v. Wilson ; with remarks upon the bearing of them on the Clergy. By JOHN GROTE, B.D. Cambridge : Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1862.

MR. GROTE says some clever things, but we do not at all agree with all he says. At the same time, we think his pamphlet ought to be read by the clergy.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, at his primary visitation in July, 1862. By LORD ARTHUR HERVEY, M.A., Archdeacon of Sudbury. Bury St. Edmunds : Jackson and Frost.

THIS charge contains some excellent things, and we are glad that it expresses so freely and plainly the author's opinion of the *Essay and Review* controversy. His lordship strongly condemns the famous volume ; he says the *Aids to Faith* is, on the whole, the best reply to it he has seen, and he generally approves of Dr. Lushington's judgment. Several other topics are touched upon in a becoming spirit.

Ad Benedicti de Spinoza opera quæ supersunt omnia supplementum. Amsterdam. 1862.

SPINOZA'S name is familiar to all, but his works are probably known to few. In the volume before us we have some things which are new. There is also a portrait of Spinoza, and a facsimile of his writing, both executed by photography. The two previous volumes were, we believe, issued some years ago, but this is uniform with them.

The Old Library and its Tales. By ELIZABETH MASON. London: Masters.

A SMALL volume on Church principles, comprising a story as its groundwork, interspersed with many other stories told by the actors. The book is one which young people will read with much pleasure. It is written very well, and its moral is good. Although a work which scarcely comes within our domain, we willingly invite attention to it, and recommend it as a very suitable addition to a family, parish, or school library.

Clark's Foreign Theological Library. History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Division I., Vol. II. Translated by Rev. D. W. SIMON. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

WE are glad to see this excellent work progressing, and we invite the attention of our readers to it. Three volumes out of four have reached us, and we shall lose no time in noticing the work at length when it is completed. We hope every theological student will add it to his library, and read it carefully. Its value is well known in Germany.

Lexicon Linguae Æthiopicæ, cum ex opere Ludolfiano tum e permultis libris manuscriptis et impressis collectum et digestum a CH. FR. AUGUSTO DILLMANN. Pars Prior. Lipsiæ. 1862.

WE have here a quarto of about 340 pages, handsomely printed on excellent paper, and comprising the results of profound researches into the Ethiopic literature and language. The work will undoubtedly rank with the best lexicons which our age has produced. To students of the Shemitic languages it will be invaluable. We look forward with interest to the completion of this publication, and shall then endeavour to present our readers with a full account of it.

Zweites Wort von 1862 über die heutigen Jesuiten und alles was mit ihnen zusammenhängt. Von HEINRICH EWALD. *Mit einem Anhang von Sieben Promotions reden.* Göttingen. 1862.

As it was it is, and as it was and is, it is likely to be with the Jesuits. They have struggled against a bad character for three centuries, and both their bad name and their struggles seem as if they were to continue.

Vom Zorne Gottes, ein biblisch-theologischer Versuch. Von Dr. F. WEBER. *Mit Prolegomenen über den bisherigen Entwicklungsgang der Grundbegriffe der Versohnungslehre.* Von Prof. F. DELITZSCH. Erlangen. 1862.

It will be quite enough to say that these pieces on the wrath of God and the Atonement are by men of recognized ability, piety, and learning; but that in some things they differ from what are called orthodox views as held by us.

La Trêve de Dieu; Souvenirs d'un Dimanche d'été. Par J. T. DE SAINT GERMAIN. Paris. 1862.

A SOMEWHAT prettily written but superficial little book about Sunday, and what the author did and saw one summer Sunday. The views represented are continental, and therefore loose. Sunday is one day in seven, a fragment of which is to be given to religion, and the chief part to recreation.

Der Prophet Jeremia erklärt. Von K. H. GRAF. Erste Hälfte. Leipzig. 1862.

IN this portion of Dr. Graf's new work on Jeremiah, we have the preface, introduction, and exposition of the first twenty-one chapters. The remainder is promised for the present autumn. The author seems to have laboured to elucidate this important portion of Scripture with care and learning.

Précis de l'Histoire de l'Eglise Reformée de Paris, d'après de documents en grande partie inédits. Par A. COQUEREL, fils. First epoch: 1512—1594. Paris. 1862.

M. ATHANASE COQUEREL, the younger, has a very decided vocation for historical subjects, and we are quite sure the work before us will richly reward a perusal.

Aus dem Heiligen Lande. Von CONSTANTIN TISCHENDORF. Leipzig. 1862.

THIS volume contains a record of the journey which resulted in the discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus, and many other rare and precious documents. We are quite sure that even such as are already familiar with the leading facts of the tour in question, will find much that is new in this volume, and, as it seems to us, told in a plain, straightforward manner.

Johannes Saresberiensis nach Leben und Studien, Schriften und Philosophie. Von Dr. C. SCHAARSCHMIDT. Leipsic: 1862.

CONSIDERABLE interest attaches to this book, relating as it does to one whose name is great among our countrymen, at a time when great men were perhaps not so common as they are now. The book is very carefully compiled.

The New Testament, translated from Griesbach's text. By SAMUEL SHARPE. Fifth edition. London: J. R. Smith.

THIS volume is neatly got up and at a low price. There seems to be a demand for it, and we are not surprised. As however we have already expressed our opinion of the merits of Mr. Sharpe's translation (see *J. S. L.*, April, 1862, p. 121), we need now only intimate the advent of a new edition.

Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff in seinen Grundzügen untersucht. Von Dr. B. WEISS. Berlin. 1862.

PROFESSOR Weiss in this volume discusses the peculiar features of the teaching of St. John in his Gospel and Epistles. The work is systematically arranged, and written in a spirit of becoming reverence.

Kirchengeschichte des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Von Dr. FERDINAND C. BAUR. Nach des Verfassers Tod herausgegeben von EDUARD ZELLER. Tübingen. 1862.

THIS volume contains a multitudinous collection of facts relating especially to the ecclesiastical history of the continent since 1800. A very small space is given to England, comprising a notice of Puseyism and a few other details.

Le Bouddha et sa Religion. Par J. B. SAINT HILAIRE. New Edition. Paris. 1862.

THIS is a highly instructive work, and we hope to be able to secure a fuller notice of it. In the meantime, we commend it to such of our readers as have not seen it.

Calvin ; sa vie, son Œuvre et ses Ecrits. Par F. BUNGNER. Paris : Cherbuliez. 1862.

WE are very glad to notice the appearance of this volume ; for although the author has an unmistakeable sympathy with his hero, he states and discusses facts with unusual candour and ability.

Le Protestantisme en Normandie, depuis la Révocation de l'édit de Nantes jusqu'à la fin du dix-huitième siècle (1685—1797). Par M. FRANCIS WADDINGTON. Paris. 1862.

A REMARKABLY interesting account of the struggles of Protestantism in Normandy. It appears that many who were persecuted for their faith in that province found shelter and liberty in England.

Le Christianisme et l'Esprit Moderne. Par M. ARBOUSSE BASTIDE. Paris. 1862.

THIS is a volume in which various religious and ecclesiastical questions of the day are discoursed upon with spirit, intelligence, and candour.

Essai de Philosophie Religieuse. Par EMILE SAISSET. Third Edition. Paris. 1862.

THE fact that this work obtained a prize from the Academy, and has reached a third edition, attests its merit, and we are glad to hear that an English translation of it will soon appear.

Precurseurs et Disciples de Descartes. Par E. SAISSET. Paris. 1862.

THIS work contains essays which in a less perfect form have appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. M. Saisset treats with much ability the lives and principles of Roger Bacon, Ramus, Descartes, Spinoza, Malebranche, etc. We have read the book with real pleasure.

The City of the Great King. London: F. Algar.

A POEM in blank verse, on the past of Jerusalem, and some other topics arising out of it. The anonymous writer expresses himself with ease, often with elegance, and sometimes with force.

The Way of the Wilderness, and other Poems. By E. C. C. B. London: Wertheim, Macintosh and Hunt.

SOME of these poems are touching and beautiful. There is a feminine grace about them, which induces us to think a lady wrote them. May she write many more.

Histoire des Dogmes Chrétiens. Par M. EUGENE HAAG. Second Edition, revue et augmentée. Paris: Cherbuliez. London: Williams and Norgate. 1862.

WE have here two volumes in large octavo, comprising about eight hundred and fifty pages, at a remarkably low price. But not only is the price low, the work is one of real utility. Its diligent author is known as one of the brothers Haag, by whom the compilation of *La France Protestante* was effected. This work is divided into two parts; the former of which is the general, and the latter the special history. The introduction, consisting of more than eighty pages, treats of many great questions connected with Biblical criticism, interpretation, etc., including the inspiration of the Bible, prophecies and miracles, tradition and Scripture, the canon of Scripture, and other weighty matters. The general history is divided into periods: from the birth of Christ to the council of Nicea; thence to the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches; thence to the Reformation; and, lastly, from that time to our own. The second part, or special history, consists of five chapters; viz., theology; theological anthropology; Christology and Soteriology; charitology or means of grace, and eschatology. An admirable index winds up the volumes, which ought to be added to those of Hagenbach and of Neander in every learned library. M. Haag is free and erudite, but not evangelical. He claims to be a simple historian, and illustrates the statements of his text by abundant and appropriate extracts from many authorities. M. Haag is of course a Presbyterian, but as we hope to give a longer notice of his work, we refrain from further criticism upon it at present, and merely indicate its appearance and topics.

MISCELLANIES.

Codex Sinaiticus.—We wish to preserve the record of an extraordinary episode in the history of this venerable MS. On September 3, the *Guardian* printed a letter from Dr. Constantine Simonides,—so well known in connexion with manuscript discoveries,—claiming to have been himself the writer of the codex in question, which he calls “the one poor work of his youth.” The following is the letter from our contemporary:—

“THE SINAI MS. OF THE GREEK BIBLE.

“As you have, in your impression of August 13, published a letter from a correspondent, signing himself F. J. A. H., in which reference is made to me, I must ask you for permission to make a statement in reply. Your correspondent favours you with some extracts from a letter written by Dr. Tregelles, in which the following sentence occurs: ‘I believe that I need hardly say that the story of Simonides, that he wrote the MS., is as false and absurd as possible.’

“The MS. referred to is that called the *Codex Sinaiticus*, now being published under the editorship of Professor Tischendorf, at the expense of the Russian government. As what Dr. Tregelles calls my ‘story’ has never been published, and as that gentleman can only have heard of it through an indirect medium, it may interest both Dr. Tregelles and your readers to have the ‘story’ direct from myself. I will tell it as briefly as possible.

“About the end of the year 1839, the venerable Benedict, my uncle, spiritual head of the monastery of the holy martyr, Panteleemon, in Mount Athos, wished to present to the Emperor Nicholas I., of Russia, some gift from the sacred mountain, in grateful acknowledgment of the presents which had, from time to time, been offered to the monastery of the martyr. Not possessing anything which he deemed acceptable, he consulted with the herald Procopius and the Russian monk Paul, and they decided upon a copy of the Old and New Testaments, written according to the ancient form, in capital letters, and on parchment. This, together with the remains of the seven apostolic fathers,—Barnabas, Hermas, Clement bishop of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, and Dionysius the Areopagite,—they proposed should be bound in gold, and presented to the emperor by a common friend. Dionysius, the professional caligrapher of the monastery, was then begged to undertake the work, but he declined, saying that the task being exceedingly difficult, he would rather not do so. In consequence of this, I myself determined to begin the work, especially as my revered uncle seemed earnestly to wish it. Having then examined the principal copies of the Holy Scriptures preserved at Mount Athos, I began to practise the principles of caligraphy; and the learned Benedict, taking a copy of the Moscow edition of both Testaments (published and presented to the Greeks by the illustrious brothers Zosimas), collated it with the ancient ones, and by this means cleared it of many errors, after which he gave it into my hands to transcribe. Having then received both the Testaments, freed from errors (the old spelling, however, remaining unaltered), being short of parchment, I selected from the library of the monastery, with Benedict’s permission, a very bulky volume, antiques bound, and almost entirely blank, the parchment of which was remarkably clean, and beautifully finished. This had been prepared apparently many centuries ago—probably by the writer or by the principal of the monastery, as it bore the inscription, ΕΚΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΟΝ (a Collection of Panegyrics), and also a short discourse much injured by time.

“I therefore took possession of this book, and prepared it by taking out the leaf containing the discourse, and by removing several others injured by time and moths, after which I began my task. First, I copied out the Old and New Testaments, then the Epistle of Barnabas, the first part of the pastoral writings of Hermas in capital letters (or uncial characters) in the style known in caligraphy as ἀμφιδέξις (*amphidexios*). The transcription of the remaining

apostolic writings, however, I declined, because the supply of parchment ran short, and the severe loss which I sustained in the death of Benedict induced me to hand the work over at once to the bookbinders of the monastery, for the purpose of replacing the original covers, made of wood and covered with leather, which I had removed for convenience—and when he had done so, I took it into my possession.

“Some time after this, having removed to Constantinople, I shewed the work to the patriarchs Anthimus and Constantius, and communicated to them the reason of the transcription. Constantius took it, and, having thoroughly examined it, urged me to present it to the library of Sinai, which I accordingly promised to do. Constantius had previously been bishop of Sinai, and since his resignation of that office had again become perpetual bishop of that place.

“Shortly after this I was placed under the protection of the illustrious Countess Etling and her brother, A. S. Stourtzas, by the co-operation of two patriarchs; but, before departing for Odessa, I went over to the island of Antigonus to visit Constantius, and to perform my promise of giving up the manuscript to the library of Mount Sinai. The patriarch was, however, absent from home, and I, consequently, left the packet for him with a letter. On his return, he wrote me the following answer:—

““My dearly beloved son in the Holy Spirit, Simonides; Grace be with you and peace from God. I received with unfeigned satisfaction your truly valuable transcript of the Holy Scriptures—namely, the Old and New Testaments, together with the epistle of St. Barnabas and the first part of the pastoral writings of Hermas, bound in one volume, which shall be placed in the library of Mount Sinai, according to your wish. But I exhort you earnestly (if ever by God’s will you should return to the sacred Mount Athos) to finish the work as you originally designed it, and He will reward you. Be with me on the 3rd of next month, that I may give you letters to the illustrious A. S. Stourtzas, to inform him of your talents and abilities, and to give you a few hints which may prove useful to the success of your plans. I sincerely trust that you were born for the honour of your country. Amen.

““CONSTANTIUS, late of Constantinople, an earnest worshipper in Christ.

““Island of Antigonus, 13th August, 1841.””

“After I had received the above letter, I again went to visit the patriarch, who gave me the kindest and most paternal advice, with letters to Stourtzas, after which I returned to Constantinople, and from thence went to Odessa in November, 1841.

“In 1846 I again returned to Constantinople, when I at once went over to the island of Antigonus to visit Constantius, and to place in his possession a large packet of MSS. He received me with the greatest kindness, and we conversed on many different subjects, amongst others upon my transcript, when he informed me that he had sent it some time previously to Mount Sinai.

“In 1852 I saw it there myself, and begged the librarian to inform me how the monastery had acquired it; but he did not appear to know anything of the matter, and I, for my part, said nothing. However, I examined the MS. and found it much altered, having an older appearance than it ought to have. The dedication to the Emperor Nicholas, placed at the beginning of the book, had been removed. I then began my philological researches, for there were several valuable MSS. in the library, which I wished to examine. Amongst them, I found the pastoral writings of Hermas, the Holy Gospel according to St. Matthew, and the disputed Epistle of Aristeeas to Philoctetes (all written on Egyptian papyrus of the first century), with others not unworthy of note. All this I communicated to Constantius, and afterwards to my spiritual father, Callistratus, at Alexandria.

“You have thus a short and clear account of the Codex Simonideios, which Professor Tischendorf, when at Sinai, contrived, I know not how, to carry away; and, going to St. Petersburg, published his discovery there under the name of the Codex Sinaiticus. When, about two years ago, I saw the first facsimiles of Tischendorf, which were put into my hand at Liverpool, by Mr.

Newton, a friend of Dr. Tregelles, I at once recognized my own work, as I immediately told him.

"The above is a true statement of the origin and history of the famous Codex Sinaiticus, which Professor Tischendorf has foisted on the learned world as a MS. of the fourth century. I have now only one or two remarks to make. The name of the professional caligraphist to the monastery of St. Panteleemon was Dionysius; the name of the monk who was sent by the Patriarch Constantius to convey the volume from the island of Antigonos to Sinai was Germanus. The volume, whilst in my possession, was seen by many persons, and it was perused with attention by the Hadji John Prodromos, son of Pappa Prodromos, who was a minister of the Greek Church in Trebizond. John Prodromos kept a coffee house in Galatas, Constantinople, and probably does so still. The note from the Patriarch Constantius, acknowledging the receipt of the MS., together with 25,000 piastres, sent to me by Constantius as a benediction, was brought to me by the Deacon Hilarion. All the persons thus named are, I believe, still alive, and could bear witness to the truth of my statement.

"Of the internal evidence of the MS. I shall not now speak. Any person learned in palæography ought to be able to tell at once that it is a MS. of the present age. But I may just note that my uncle Benedict corrected the MS. in many places, and as it was intended to be re-copied, he marked many letters which he proposed to have illuminated. The corrections in the handwriting of my uncle I can, of course, point out; as also those of Dionysius the caligraphist. In various places I marked in the margin the initials of the different MSS. from which I had taken certain passages and readings. These initials appear to have greatly bewildered Professor Tischendorf, who has invented several highly ingenious methods of accounting for them. Lastly, I declare my ability to point to two distinct pages in the MS., though I have not seen it for years, in which is contained the most unquestionable proof of its being my writing.

"In making this statement, I know perfectly well the consequences I shall bring upon myself; but I have so long been accustomed to calumny, that I have grown indifferent to it; and I now solemnly declare that my only motive for publishing this letter is to advance the cause of truth, and protect sacred letters from imposition.

"In conclusion, you must permit me to express my sincere regret that, whilst the many valuable remains of antiquity in my possession are frequently attributed to my own hands, the one poor work of my youth is set down by a gentleman who enjoys a great reputation for learning, as the earliest copy of the Sacred Scriptures.

"C. SIMONIDES."

As a pendant to the letter of Dr. Simonides, we present our readers with a discussion of it, which appeared in the *Clerical Journal* of September 11. This article is, if anything, too gentle, and by no means brings out fully the palæographic difficulties with which Dr. Simonides will have to contend: it is however very suggestive, and so far satisfactory. Surely after this Dr. Simonides will study to be quiet.

"*Dr. Simonides and the Codex Sinaiticus.*—So it seems, after all, that the Sinaitic MS. of the Bible, about which we have all been talking for the last three years, is a modern production! The document which the first palæographers in Europe have agreed to accept as the most ancient Biblical manuscript known, was, we are told, actually written but little more than twenty years ago. We are indebted for this information to that same Constantine Simonides whose name has so often been before the public, and who not long since published a fragment of St. Matthew's Gospel, which he assigns to the first century. Vague rumours arose a little time ago to the effect that this gentleman claimed to have written the Sinaitic Codex himself. Now at length the matter is placed beyond a doubt, by a letter from him, printed in the

Guardian of September 3. The marvellous story he tells, supported as it is by names, dates, documents, and other matters, seems to merit a few observations. He has deliberately laid his claim before the world, and he must expect that it will be subjected to criticism. For this, indeed, he is prepared, as he observes: 'In making this statement, I know perfectly well the consequences I shall bring upon myself; but I have so long been accustomed to calumny, that I have grown indifferent to it; and I now solemnly declare that my only motive for publishing this letter is to advance the cause of truth, and protect sacred letters from imposition.' Such is the deliberate and solemn avowal of a writer who will suffer no calumny from us, but who must not complain if we call attention to a few facts. Our only motive, also, is to advance the cause of truth, and to protect sacred letters from imposition.

"First of all, we would ask why Dr. Simonides has not published his statement earlier? The first announcements of the discovery of the Codex were made in 1859, and were speedily followed by minute descriptions of the volume and its contents. Narratives more or less detailed continued to appear, till, in 1860, Dr. Tischendorf issued his *Notitia editionis codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici*, with a circumstantial narrative, collations, extracts, various readings, and allusions to Dr. Simonides and his text of Hermas. Subsequently other accounts were multiplied; a magnificent edition in facsimile was undertaken, and a second for more popular use. The time is now come for the completion of the splendid edition executed at so much pains and cost. Through all this, Dr. Simonides has been imperturbably silent, and only at the last moment does he write to undeceive the world. He repudiates his private intimations of the asserted fact, although he admits having seen and recognized the facsimiles two years ago. We can only say that such conduct is most unaccountable, and that a man who was in possession of so momentous a secret ought to have proclaimed it on the house-tops. This has not been done, and Simonides must take all the consequences of his tardy confession.

"And now for the story itself, which may be told in few words; and we hope our readers will observe the dates. About the end of 1839, Benedict, the uncle of Simonides, wished to present some gift from Mount Athos to Nicholas I. of Russia. Not finding anything suitable, the herald Procopius, and the Russian monk Paul were consulted, 'and they decided upon a copy of the Old and New Testaments, written according to the ancient form, in capital letters, and on parchment. This, together with the remains of the seven apostolic fathers—Barnabas, Hermas, Clement bishop of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, and Dionysius the Areopagite—they proposed should be bound in gold, and presented to the Emperor by a common friend.' Let us observe in passing, that it is assumed that not only the text of Hermas, but also that of Papias, was accessible. It appears that Dionysius, 'the professional caligrapher of the monastery,' declined to undertake the work on account of its difficulty. Had Simonides told us it was its magnitude, we could have realized the fact, but surely a 'professional caligrapher' ought to have found no difficulty if the texts were at hand. What this expert declined a novice attempted. Simonides examined the principal copies of the Scriptures at Mount Athos, and 'began to practise the principles of caligraphy.' His uncle Benedict furnished him with a printed text, which he had collated with the ancient ones and corrected. We are not told how long these preliminaries took, but it must have been some time. Deliberations and decisions, the art of caligraphy, and the collation and correction of a Bible, in a case like this, must have occupied a good many months—a year would be little enough, especially when we remember that in preparing the text or 'copy' the old spelling would have to be introduced as well as the variations of reading.

"Dr. Simonides says he found in the library a large volume in ancient binding, almost blank, consisting of beautifully dressed and remarkably clean parchment. This book was inscribed *Εκλογιον Πανηγυρικον*, and contained one short discourse, much injured by time, and occupying one leaf. The scribe prepared his book by taking out the written leaf and 'several others injured by time and moths.' We admit that this may be possibly correct, but it is very

unlikely that a volume so bound, 'remarkably clean,' and 'beautifully dressed,' should contain one written leaf and a few others much injured by time and moths. Time and moths are very eccentric, we know, but seldom so much so as to destroy part of a volume, the rest of which has been left clean enough and beautiful enough to form materials for a new volume to be presented to an emperor.

"After these preliminaries, Simonides copied the Old and New Testaments, the epistle of Barnabas, and the first part of Hermas, and he did this in the uncial characters which we find in Codex A, Codex B, and the like. Here he stopped; the supply of parchment ran short, and his uncle died; so the book was handed over to the binders to have its old covers put on again. When this was done, Dr. Simonides says, 'I took it into my possession.' We are not favoured with the date at which this occurred, but we do read, that '*some time after this*, having removed to Constantinople, I shewed the work to the patriarchs Anthimus and Constantius, and communicated to them the reason of the transcription.' At the request of Constantius, Dr. Simonides agreed to present the book to the library of Sinai. Shortly after this, Simonides removed to Odessa, but before leaving, placed the volume at the house of Constantius, then not at home. Very soon after this, probably, Constantius wrote to Simonides a flattering letter, which may be read in the *Guardian* of last week, and which is dated August 13, 1841. Now let the reader reflect that the chain of events so far only reaches from 'about the end' of 1839 to August 13th (i. e., says the 25th with us), 1841. Will any man be found to believe that these dates are correct? The preliminaries, the execution, and the history of the work thus far extend over some twenty months. Now the fragment of the manuscript found by Tischendorf contains three hundred and forty-five leaves and a half, folio size, four columns to a page, and written in the exquisitely formed uncials of the early ages. When complete, the volume must have contained from eleven hundred to twelve hundred pages.

"The next remark we have to make is, that the Sinaitic MS. has been corrected in about eight thousand places. Now to read, to verify, and to insert these corrections must have been an enormous labour. How does Simonides account for them? He briefly observes that his uncle Benedict corrected the MS. in many places, and that, if necessary, he can point out both his corrections and those of Dionysius the caligraphist. Let those who will accept this explanation; one thing we know, that in the extracts given by Tischendorf, in the *Notitia*, there is at page 24 a Greek note to this effect: "Remember, Lord, the soul of the sinner Dionysius, a monk, when Thou comest in Thy kingdom.' Of course, we shall be told that this is [his friend] the caligrapher, but we shall hesitate to admit the explanation.

"In 1846 Simonides says, he went again to Constantinople, where the patriarch told him he 'had some time previously sent' the manuscript to Sinai. This fairly implies that it had not been long sent. In 1862 Simonides saw the MS. at Sinai, but the librarian, when asked how they got it, did not seem to know anything of the matter; 'and I, for my part, said nothing,' adds Dr. Simonides. We add the question, Who will believe this? or, if it be true, why was the librarian ignorant and left in ignorance? More than this: the MS. was much altered, and had an older appearance than it ought to have, and the dedication to Nicholas had been removed. The dedication, therefore, had been written, and yet we are assured that the work was to have been rewritten, although so carefully executed and upon so valuable a material.

"Simonides tells us that when at Sinai he found 'the pastoral writings of Hermas, the Holy Gospel according to St. Matthew, and the disputed epistle of Aristæas to Philoctetes,' all written on Egyptian papyrus of the first century. Manuscripts of St. Matthew and of Hermas in uncials, and on Egyptian papyrus of the first century! Surely this is incredible. Was Hermas written in the first century? Is there a critic who ventures to think it older than the date assigned by the Muratorian fragment—the middle of the second century? Alas! Dr. Simonides cares nothing for critics, and here claims to have seen a MS. written before the work it contains was composed. As for the MS. of St.

Matthew, why have we heard no more of it? Truth may be stranger than fiction, but here at least we feel compelled to doubt. To be honest, we believe that Simonides labours under an hallucination not unlike that of poor John Clare, the poet, who fancies that he wrote the poems which bear the names of Shakspeare, Milton, Byron, etc.

"Simonides says he marked certain initials in the margins of his MS. He also mentions the names of a number of persons who may confirm his statements, and who are still living. Let those who will try to consult these persons, including the coffee-house keeper at Galatas: we do not think it necessary. The story we have heard condemns itself as one of the wildest tissues of inconsistency which we have been called to notice for many a day. If the statements are true, the production of the work was a modern miracle. Twenty short months never saw so much accomplished by one individual since the art of writing was invented. We simply do not believe the accuracy for the narrative, and repeat our conviction that the writer suffers from some unusual hallucination.

"Be it observed, he does not say one word about the ink. Yet those who have studied the MS. regard it as supplying an unquestioned argument for high antiquity. His reasons for other peculiarities of the volume are such as no critic will admit.

"We must not close just yet. In 1844, Dr. Tischendorf procured the Friderico-Augustan fragments, which are, we believe, identified as part of this Codex Sinaïticus; yet, in 1844, the volume could not have been more than three years old, and could only just have reached the monastery. Again, in 1845 or 1846, a Russian Archimandrite, named Porphyrius, seems unquestionably to have stumbled upon the Sinai MS. But Simonides affirms that he saw the volume (not fragments of it), at Sinai in 1852. It is certain that in 1859 Tischendorf found what remained wrapped up in a rag. So that there is no possible way of reconciling the story of Simonides, either with probability, or with what others say they saw. Leaving out of view the dates and facts of 1844, 1845, and 1846, it seems that seven short years were sufficient for the mutilation of this splendid MS., and for its partial destruction, as well as for its transformation into a book which the first scholars in Europe say bears all the marks of an antiquity of fourteen hundred and fifty to fifteen hundred years. If there was a miracle in its production, there is a heap of miracles in its subsequent history. It was written, corrected, perused with attention, etc., in the course of a few months; was sent to Sinai, where in a few months more its origin was forgotten; it was in fragments in 1844, 1845, and 1846, but complete (except the dedication) in 1852, and in 1859 was found a wreck wrapped in a rag. If Dr. Simonides has no better tale to tell than the one which we have analyzed, our faith has nothing to fear, and the Codex Sinaïticus will retain its proud pre-eminence.

"The names he gives us are not worth anything, until impartial and independent persons can shew that they are realities and represent true witnesses. Dr. Simonides must be aware that with the overwhelming internal evidence of the MS., it is not likely that his names will be hunted up. We conclude, therefore, that it is impossible for Dr. Simonides to prove that this Bible was 'the one poor work of my youth,' or of anybody else's youth now among the living. Far be it from us to say one harsh or unkind word. Our feelings are those of profound regret that such things should be believed, and of commiseration for the man who so solemnly, and it seems sincerely, publishes them to the world."

The Hebrew Scriptures.—The labour expended by the Jews in copying the Scriptures has always distinguished them, as far as we have the means of knowing what their habits in this respect have been. In one sense at least they appear to have been faithful to their trust, as to whom "were committed the oracles of God," (Romans iii. 2)—they did not alter or mutilate the sacred text. Our Saviour charged the Jews of their having

committed sin ; but he did not accuse them, or their fathers, of having corrupted the records of their religious faith. The rules which they follow in preparing copies of the Pentateuch for public use illustrate their vigilance in watching over the sacred books. They assign the work of transcribing them to a parchment, to a class of men who are especially trained for the service. Only one sort of parchment, and that prepared in a certain way, can be used. The ink must be of a definite kind. Every page must contain a prescribed number of lines, and every line the same number of words and letters. The slightest error vitiates a copy ; a letter too much or too little on a page obliges the scribe to throw aside his work and begin anew. No copy is allowed to be read in synagogue till it has been examined by competent men, and pronounced free from every defect. The Old Testament has been handed down among the Jews, under a system of rigid supervision. The fact is one of immense importance, as shewing, in concurrence with other facts, that the Hebrew Scriptures remain as they were written at first ; and we have in them the very words which Moses, David and Isaiah addressed to their cotemporaries, an drecorded for our instruction.—*Hackett*.

The First Printed Hebrew Bible.—The first edition of the whole of the Hebrew Bible was executed by Abraham ben Chaim, at Soncino, in 1488, folio, with points. An edition, in octavo, was printed at Brecia, Italy, in 1494, by Gerson Moses ben Moses Menzeln. This latter edition is the one made use of by Luther in his German translation, and his own copy of it is still preserved in the royal library at Berlin. Besides these, there were published at Soncino, in 1494, a folio and quarto edition without points, and an octavo one with small types and points. Portions of Scripture in Hebrew were published before. The Psalms in Hebrew with the commentary of Kimchi were printed in 1477, quarto, by Joseph and his son Chaim Mordecai, and Hezekiah Monro, who printed only three hundred of them. The Pentateuch, with the Targum and the Commentary of R. Jarchi (Rashi), was printed at Bologna in Italy, in 1482, in folio. Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and Lamentations, with the Commentary of Jarchi ; and Esther with the Commentary of Abraham Aben Ezra, were printed also at Bologna, in folio, in the same year. The former and latter Prophets were first printed in Hebrew at Soncino, in 1486, in folio, with the Commentary of Rabbi Kimchi. The Hagiographa were printed at Naples, 1486, in small folio, together with several rabbinical commentaries.—*Gleaner*.

Traditions of the Deluge among the Malays.—After the islands had been peopled by the first man and woman, a great rain took place, by which they were finally submerged ; but, before the highest places were covered by the waters, two large double canoes made their appearance. In one of these was Rokora, the god of carpenters : in the other, Rokola, his head workman, who picked up some of the people, and kept them on board until the waters had subsided ; after which they were again landed on the island. It is reported that in former times canoes were always kept in readiness against another inundation. The persons thus saved, eight

in number, were landed at Mbenga, where the highest of their gods is said to have made his first appearance. By virtue of this tradition, the chiefs of Mbenga take rank before all others, and have always acted a conspicuous part among the Fijis. They style themselves Ngali-duva-ki-langi (subject to heaven alone).—*Hardwick's "Christ and other Masters."*

Discoveries at Pompeii.—The house upon which the workmen are at present (Aug. 9, 1862) engaged is of considerable size. It displays an average amount of the ordinary decoration which prevails in middle-class Pompeian houses; and it also presents on its outer walls several of those curious electioneering addresses in which Pompeian candidates, or their friends, were wont to appeal to the municipal electors. It was not, however, until yesterday that the expectations and consequent vigilance of the excavators were raised beyond the ordinary degree. In a corner of one of the inner rooms was found a heap of silver and copper coins, to the number of above five hundred. They had seemingly been tied up together in a little bag, which, however, has entirely disappeared; and at first they were agglutinated into a mass, although they have since been separated without difficulty. At the same time, and near the same spot, were found two large shears or scissors, and soon afterwards a house-mill of the ordinary description, together with a little heap of corn, the grains blackened indeed and somewhat shrivelled, but yet fully preserving their shape and very little diminished in size. Even if these indications had not sufficiently pointed out the house as a baker's establishment, all doubt was removed this morning by the discovery in the next apartment, not only of the metal scoop or shovel with which the loaves were placed in the oven, but also of the oven itself, the mouth of which was closed with a large iron door, not attached by hinges, but simply, as at present, cemented at the edges to the faces of the four large slabs which formed the mouth of the oven. At the moment when, in company with the courteous and accomplished director, I entered the bakehouse, the workmen were in the act of endeavouring to remove the iron door, but one of the handles gave way in the attempt. A little patience and care, however, overcame the difficulty, and it was no sooner withdrawn than we were rewarded with the sight of the entire batch of loaves, such as they were deposited in the oven seventeen hundred and eighty-three years ago. They are eighty-two in number, and are all, so far as regards form, size, and indeed every characteristic except weight and colour, precisely as they came from the baker's hand. When it is remembered that up to the present time but two such loaves had been discovered, one of them imperfect, the interest of this discovery will be fully appreciated. I ought to add, however, that, unlike the loaf in the Museo Borbonico, which is stamped SILIGO . CRANII . E . CICER ., these loaves have no baker's name or other mark. They are circular, about nine inches in diameter, rather flat, and indented (evidently with the elbow), in the centre; but they are slightly raised at the sides, and divided by deep lines radiating from the centre into eight segments. They are of a deep brown colour, and hard, but exceedingly light.

I ought not to omit that this year's excavations have brought to light a number of exceedingly curious and interesting *graffiti*, as well as many

so-called *programme*, or inscriptions, in colour or charcoal, one of which, as published in the *Bolletino Archeologico* of Rome, contains a distinct allusion to the Christians, and under that name. C. W. RUSSELL.—*Athenæum*.

Assyrian Antiquities.—Lisieux, Sept. 7, 1862. The Museum of Paris contains an inscription of *Hammurabi, King of Babylon*, of the greatest interest to Assyrian scholars. It is well known that the kings who entitle themselves *Kings of Babylon* belong to two different periods, separated by about seven centuries. The first period began with the foundation of the Assyrian empire, nearly in the twentieth century B.C., and finished in the middle of the sixteenth. After an interval of two hundred years commences the ascendancy of Nineveh, which became the metropolis of the great Assyrian kingdom. During this period the Kings of Assyria added to their qualification of King of Assyria the title of *Sakkanaku of Babylon*, and never styled themselves King of Babylon, nor allowed any one to assume this title. But after the downfall of Nineveh, Babylon became the metropolis, and the Kings of Assyria called themselves again Kings of Babylon.

According to the inscriptions of the kings of the first period, it was doubtful to several scholars whether the Chaldeans spoke then the same language as their successors of the second Chaldean empire, because the documents were written with characters taken in their ideographical value. The inscription of Hammurabi, in the Museum of Paris, the single record of an important event belonging to this period, is written in phonetical characters, and resolves the question,—all the characters admitting an explanation based on the same principles and the same rules as the great historical inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser, Sardanapalus, Sargon, Sennacherib, or the larger architectural documents of Nebuchadnezzar, Neriglissor and Nabonidus. I had the honour to submit a French translation of this remarkable inscription to the Institute of France in the sitting of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres of the 6th of February last. JOCHIM MENANT, Juge au Tribunal de Lisieux.—*Athenæum*.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

~~~~~  
No. IV.—JANUARY, 1863.  
~~~~~

COLENZO AND THE PENTATEUCH: THE CRITICISM OF
ARITHMETIC.*

“Romanas autem Soliti contemnere leges,
Judaicum ediscunt, et servant, ac metuunt jus,
Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses.”

PROBABLY Juvenal knew very little about the volume which he nevertheless ascribes to Moses. It is very likely true that Tacitus took less trouble to estimate the stories he tells of Moses and the Jews, than he did to collect them. Diodorus Siculus did not trouble himself to criticize when he wrote that Moses ascribed to Jehovah the authorship of the laws he published. Trogus Pompeius, and his continuator Justin, merely adopted a vulgar story when they gave their version of the early history of the Jews. Strabo never asked himself whether the Jewish record, as he gathered it, was true. The versatile Apuleius and the grave collector Pliny, were perhaps much more critical when they set down Moses as a magician. Longinus expressed no opinion at all when he quoted Moses as sublime. All the heathen writers, extant and not extant, quoted by Josephus and Eusebius, or not quoted by them, may be put out of court as credulous people, who would believe anything if they believed that Moses

* *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.* By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. (Part I.) 8vo, pp. xxxviii., 160. London: Longmans.

wrote the Pentateuch. As for the Jews themselves, they must have been the basest of people,—*natio nata servituti*—as Cicero properly calls them. But there can be no excuse for the succession of learned and philosophic men who, for eighteen centuries in the Christian Church, have believed Moses to be the author of a true history. We can imagine that in the first ages, when Theophilus discoursed so learnedly to Autolycus, when Justin Martyr addressed his exhortation to the Greeks, and when men like Quadratus, Aristides, Claudius Apollinaris, and Melito, could defend their belief in Moses and Christ before emperors; there were means of testing what they wrote. It is hard to believe that a mind like that of Origen would have failed to detect the spuriousness of the Pentateuch, if it had been spurious. Nor can we readily suppose that sceptics like Celsus, Porphyry, etc., would have overlooked any historical evidence that the books of Moses were forgeries. Whereas, with Celsus for example, Origen, like the other apologists, can take all this for granted. The sceptics did accuse the record of some falsehoods, but they did not question its authorship and its substantial truthfulness. Eusebius of Cæsarea ransacked the chronicles and literature, we might almost say of the world; but both in his *Chronicon* and in his *Preparation for the Gospel*, as elsewhere, he believes in Moses with a faith which would do honour to Cyprian, Tertullian, or Augustine.

We now learn that pagans and Jews, Christians and Mahomedans, have all alike been in error. A bishop of the Church of England has had doubt sown in his mind by a Zulu Caffre in Natal. This doubt has led to the application of certain tests to the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua; and the right reverend prelate has come all the way from South Africa to tell us they have been weighed in his balances and found wanting. The announcement in question follows very hard upon the discovery, so hard indeed that some will say it reminds them of the philosopher who rushed out of the bath undressed, and ran through the streets exclaiming, Eureka! Eureka! Here we are afraid the parallel ceases, for Archimedes had only discovered how much brass was mixed with the gold, whereas our Archimedes has found that the crown contains no gold whatever. The process by which he has arrived at this result is very simple so far. He has turned his mathematical studies to account, and proved by simple arithmetical calculations that certain statements are inconsistent, impossible, and incredible. No one will complain that the bishop has tried to bring figures to bear upon the facts of the Pentateuch. He had a right to do this, and it is natural that he should do it, for he is the author of an

•

Arithmetic and of an *Algebra*, which are almost as well known among school-boys as the well-known lines, "Multiplication is vexation," etc. Having taught the sons, he now seeks to teach the fathers. This too is praiseworthy; but we complain that from a few passages involving certain calculations, he has inferred the history of the Pentateuch to be a fiction, and that Moses wrote none of it.

We shall not question Dr. Colenso's sincerity and earnestness, neither shall we criticize the preface and introduction, in which he records his motives, his processes, and his conclusions. There are nevertheless many things in these earlier pages which lie open to animadversion, and we omit them only to confine our article within reasonable limits. Our business will be with the substance of the book; and it will be to state the objections brought by the bishop against the Mosaic books, and to suggest replies to some of them. If in any case we have omitted to answer fully, or at all, the objections which are advanced, we can only plead the imperative necessity for brevity. We shall "nothing extenuate, nor aught set down in malice," but honestly, and in as simple a manner as we can, shall state what we have to say. To the more learned and more profound replies which the book will receive, we must refer our readers for fuller satisfaction if they require it.

The first formal reason which Dr. Colenso gives for believing the Pentateuch not historically true, is found in the account of the family of Judah. Among the descendants of Judah enumerated in Gen. xvi. 12, we find the names of Hezron and Hamul the sons of Pharez. The bishop believes the writer meant to say that Hezron and Hamul were born in Canaan, and were among those who went into Egypt with Jacob. He then lays it down as a principle that Judah was only forty-two years old when he went into Egypt. During these forty-two years he says Judah grew up, married, and had three sons; two of these three sons also grew up and married and died; the third son also grew up, and refused to marry his brother's widow. This widow had two sons by Judah, and one of them also grew up and had two sons. Now, he concludes either that Hezron and Hamul were born in Canaan as the history relates, or they were born in Egypt, which it seems to contradict. If they were born in Canaan the history cannot be true, because forty-two years is not time enough for the events recorded. If they were born in Egypt the history is not true, because it reckons them with those who went down to Egypt.

The difficulty thus stated is an ancient one, and has been discussed by a multitude of writers, who have given various

solutions of it.^b But first of all it is to be observed that Judah may have been, and no doubt was, more than forty-two when he went into Egypt. According to Hales, Judah must have been eight years older than Joseph, and not three years only, as Dr. Colenso says. From Genesis xxx. it is clear that Jacob had seven children by Bilhah, Zilpah, and Leah, between the birth of Judah and that of Joseph; nor does the sacred narrative tell us how many years intervened. Here then we believe is the first error of the bishop. The book of Genesis records actual facts, but not always in the order in which they occurred.^c Thus

^b To illustrate this point, and to shew how the case has been put and argued by profound believers, it will suffice to quote the summary of Rev. H. C. Groves (*Commentary on Genesis*, 1861), in his note upon verses 8—27 of this chapter.

"The sacred writer does not mean to assert that all these descendants of Jacob were born before the removal into Egypt. His intention evidently is to give, at this important epoch, an exact list of those who became *heads of families* in Israel, and in making it he evidently regards Jacob's immediate descendants, who were born in Egypt, as having come in the persons of their fathers into Egypt. The arguments which prove that he does not give an historical account of the individuals who came in Jacob's company to Egypt are these:—

"(a.) When Jacob's sons were preparing for their second journey to Egypt, Reuben had evidently only *two* sons (ch. xlii. 37); here four sons are given to him, two of whom must have been born in Egypt. (b.) Since Joseph was now about thirty-nine years old (ch. xli. 46; xlv. 6), Benjamin could not have been more than twenty-four years old, and, consistently with this, the previous narratives throughout represent him as a youth; here ten sons are given him, who therefore must have been born after the removal from Canaan. (c.) The sons of Pharez (ver. 12) must also have been born in Egypt. The whole period of Jacob's sojourn in Canaan, after his return from exile, was only about thirty years. This interval is too brief to include the marriage of Judah, the birth of a son, Pharez, after the sons by his first marriage had reached maturity, and the births of grand-children, the children of Pharez. The birth of Pharez must be placed a very short time before the removal from Canaan. (d.) In ver. 5, and xliii. 8, mention is made only of Jacob, his sons and their little ones; in this list Jacob's great grand-children are mentioned as well. (e.) In Numbers xxvi., where the list of heads of families is given, not a single grandson of Jacob is mentioned in addition to those mentioned here; it is against all probability that no more sons should have been born to Jacob's sons after they had entered Egypt. On the other hand, that the writer speaks of the yet unborn grandsons and great grandsons of Jacob as entering Egypt in the persons of their fathers, appears from the following considerations:—

"(a.) In ver. 27 it is said, "All the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt were threescore and ten." Among these he reckons the two sons of Joseph, who were certainly born in Egypt. Another instance of this mode of speaking is found in Deut. x. 22. (b.) The grand-children of Jacob are spoken of as the children borne by his wives; *e.g.* (ver. 15) "These be the sons of Leah, which she bare unto Jacob in Padan-Aram. . . . All the souls of his sons and his daughters were thirty and three." Here the grand-children are viewed as existing in their fathers. (c.) A similar conception is found in ver. 4, "I will go down with thee into Egypt, and I will also surely bring thee up again." Comp. Hengstenberg, *Pent.*, ii. 290; Kurtz, ii. 6; Delitzsch, p. 563.

^c A Jewish friend, well known for his attainments, reminds us that it is a rabbinical dictum that "In the law (Pentateuch) there is nothing before and nothing after," *i.e.*, that a chronological order is not adhered to.

it is almost, if not quite, certain, that some of the events recorded in chap. xxxviii. occurred before Joseph was sold. In truth the Bible was not meant to teach us chronology, and our inability to fix the dates of some of its narratives is sufficiently understood. The true age of Judah when he went into Egypt is unknown, and that of Joseph himself is not certain.

Secondly, were Hezron and Hamul born in Egypt or in Canaan? If in Canaan, Judah must have been older than is commonly believed, but not so old as Bishop Colenso seems to think. Judah married young, and so did his sons. When Er and Onan died, his third son Shelah was not of marriageable age, but as soon as he was he refused to marry Tamar. Judah may then have been less than forty when Pharez was born, as recorded at the close of chap. xxxviii. The next chapter goes on with the history of Joseph, which had been broken off abruptly at the close of chap. xxxvii.; and the first trace we find of Pharez afterwards is in chap. xlvi. 12, along with his sons Hezron and Hamul, who are then first referred to. Now a careful examination of chap. xlvi. will shew that the list of names is intercalated into the narrative. Verse 7 is followed historically by verse 28; and verse 8 begins like Exod. i. 1, by saying, "and these are the names of the children of Israel which came into Egypt." While, however, in chap. xlvi. we have all the names, in Exod. i. we only have a part of them. We are, therefore, led to infer that the list is not meant to give us all Jacob's sons and grandsons, but only such of his grandsons as there was special reason to mention. Hezron and Hamul stood to him in a peculiar relation. To this it may be replied that Heber and Malchiel the grandsons of Asher are named. We answer, not for the same reason, but because they were actually born in Canaan. But Hezron and Hamul are named in the catalogue, because they were regarded as substituted for Er and Onan, although not born in Canaan. That they were not necessarily born in Canaan may be admitted without danger. Jacob's descendants would have been seventy but for the death of two, and to supply their places, those who in God's providence afterwards became their representatives in Israel are included. The number seventy is made up in this way,

Jacob	1
His daughter Dinah	1
Joseph	1
Hezron and Hamul	2
Jacob's eleven sons	11
Asher's two grandsons	2
Asher's daughter	1
Jacob's grandsons	51
	<hr/>
	70
	<hr/>

This gives us Jacob, his daughter Dinah, his granddaughter Serah, his fifty-one grandsons, his four great-grandsons, and his twelve sons. Of these Jacob, Joseph and his two sons, must be deducted, which leaves sixty-six. His sons' wives are not included in the catalogue. In chapter xlv., ver. 26, it is distinctly enough said that all the souls descended from Jacob were sixty-six. Now, since Hezron and Hamul are among them, it may perhaps be asked, how can they have been born in Egypt? Our reply is based upon the very next verse, in which we are told that Joseph's sons were born in Egypt, and yet that "all the souls of the house of Jacob *which came into Egypt* were threescore and ten." This renders it clear as noonday that we must not look for that nice and minute discrimination in an ancient Hebrew narrative which our mathematical critic asks for. The writer knew perfectly well, and he tells us that Manasseh and Ephraim were born in Egypt, and yet he joins them as part of those who came into Egypt. The extraordinary brevity and absence of explanations, of which we here have one instance, finds a striking parallel in Exod. i. 5 : "And all the souls which came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls, for Joseph was in Egypt already." This could not be understood without comparison with other passages ; but with them we find all things plain and easy. The seventy souls were not merely Jacob, his sons and his daughters, nor merely they and his grandsons in addition, but included some of his great-grandsons. Only by a figure of speech did they "come out of the loins of Jacob;" and only by a like figure of speech did they all come down into Egypt (Gen. xlv. 27), because some of them were certainly born in Egypt. If some of them were certainly born there, others, as Hezron and Hamul, may have been born there though we know it not. In Deut. x. 22 we read, "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons;" where the number is the same as in Genesis. But in Acts vii. 1, 14, Stephen says, "Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls." In effect we find that the LXX. which St. Luke follows, has "threescore and fifteen," both in Gen. xlv. 27, and in Exod. i. 5, but not in Deut. x. 22.

These three passages are all we can find in which the number is stated, but Dr. Colenso, who cites them, shews his bias by saying, "The statement that Hezron and Hamul were born in the land of Canaan is vouched so positively by *the many passages* above quoted, which sum up the 'seventy souls,' that to give up this point is to give up an essential part of the whole story." We leave it to the reader to judge whether "the statement that

Hezron and Hamul were born in the land of Canaan is vouched ' at all. Certainly it is nowhere asserted, and we have seen that in other details a literal interpretation is not intended. To separate the literal from the figurative is the proper work of the expositor; and this is what the bishop has not done. If we must be rigidly literal, Jacob himself must be counted as one of his own descendants (Gen. xlv. 15).

Upon the whole subject we offer the following remarks. The genealogies have always been a favourite point of attack with sceptical critics; and it will be seen that Bishop Colenso is not an exception. Like the passages which involve statements of numbers, the lists of names have come down to us, it must be admitted, in an exceptionally corrupt state. Whether transcribers were more careless or found these portions more difficult, or whether glosses and other notes for national, personal, or family reasons were insinuated into the text, we know not. One thing we know; and that is, that the separate copies of the genealogies are not altogether alike, and that even in those of Gen. xlv. (repeated in Numb. xxvi. and 1 Chron. vii. and viii.) the copies exhibit frequent variations. As Mr. Wright says in his *Genesis* upon chap. xlv., with reference to the differences of reading, "It should, however, be borne in mind: 1. That the list here given is that of those sons of Benjamin who went down into Egypt, whilst those in Numbers and 1 Chron. are drawn up without any reference to that event: 2. That in the catalogue of Numb. xxvi., we have a list of the then existing families of the tribe of Benjamin, and that therefore all of his sons who died without issue are omitted in it: 3. That the genealogical lists in Scripture do not always carefully distinguish between the children and the grand-children. . . . The genealogical lists appear indeed to be very corrupt." Dr. Raphall says: "This genealogy became a document of the utmost importance to the future generations. But notwithstanding its importance, several differences exist between this table and that prepared under the eye of Moses, at the second enumeration of the people (Numb. xxvi.), and also that in 1 Chron. But these differences, though offering some difficulty, are by no means irreconcilable, for spelling often varies; many individuals had two names, and some families became extinct." These genealogies seem to have been an ancient bone of contention; and it is by no means certain that St. Paul does not refer to them, when he reproves the unprofitable cavilling and disputing caused by endless genealogies. His words are so remarkable as to merit special attention. Timothy was to charge his friends at Ephesus not to teach a different doctrine, "nor to apply themselves to myths and interminable

genealogies which bring in discussions rather than edification" (1 Tim. i. 4.) Similarly noticeable is what he says to Titus (iii. 9) ; "Stand aloof from foolish discussions and genealogies," etc. The efforts of the Jews in different ages to trace, expound, and reconcile these genealogies are sufficiently known, at least it is well known that such efforts have been made with all the acuteness and minute criticism for which the Jews are famous. Upon these genealogical differences and obscurities Christian writers have said perhaps all that can be said, and certainly much more than Bishop Colenso can answer. Besides, he proceeds on the absurd supposition that the history cannot be true, which in some of its parts, and even in documents quoted, presents difficulties which we cannot solve.

Viewing the book of Genesis as a collection and compilation from previously existing documents, or as a collection of historical facts not always in the exact order of chronology, we relieve ourselves of many difficulties. The second principle has been yielded in reference to the Gospels, or some of them, and it is neither thought irreverent, audacious, nor heretical, to construct a harmony of the four Gospels, and to make a chronological arrangement of them. It has been long felt by some that there are passages in the Pentateuch similarly requiring or justifying transposition. The same is true of other books. Surely, for example, no critic would vindicate the order of Jeremiah, as it now stands in the Hebrew Bibles : in all probability these ancient documents were written in small portions, and were disarranged by their editors or transcribers. Even the *Koran* of Mohammed presents us with a remarkable case in point.

We omit the discussion of the third chapter upon the explanations of expositors, because we wish to keep to our own. Doubtless we shall be added to the lists of those who have recourse to shifts ; but we cannot help it. In explaining an ancient and obscure author, it is essential to resort to expedients, and Dr. Colenso has done this abundantly.

The next example, in the fourth chapter, is on "the size of the court of the tabernacle compared with the number of the congregation." Dr. Colenso quotes, not very accurately, Lev. viii. 1—4 (not viii. 14, as he gives it) ; "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying. . . . Gather thou (all) the congregation together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Moses did as Jehovah commanded him. And the assembly was gathered (together) unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." He says, "the assembly," "the whole assembly," and "all the congregation," are meant of the whole body of the people, or at all events of the adult males in the prime of life among them, and

not merely the elders or heads of the people. We can admit this. His argument is intended to shew, by an arithmetical calculation, that it was impossible for the whole assembly, and even for the 603,550 warriors, to gather at the door of the tabernacle. He asserts that they must have come within the court. He shews that only nine men could have stood in front of the tabernacle, and that in rows of nine, the adult males would have reached twenty miles. But suppose the court was filled; it could at most have contained but 5000. "The Levites," he says, "were 8,580, of whom only 504 could have stood within the court in front of the tabernacle, and not two-thirds of them could have entered the court at all."

This looks very formidable of course, but it only looks so. In plain language we should reply that there was a general command for the assembly in question, and a general gathering in consequence. Supposing that the order extended to the men alone, it is not to be imagined that they were all present. There would be multitudes prevented from attendance; some by sickness, some by occupations which they could not leave, some by military duties, as guards of the camp, some by sheer neglect and disobedience. Many causes would thus combine to keep thousands away. Just as now, a city meeting, a town meeting, a national demonstration, or a general gathering, may comprise at most a few thousands, when hundreds of thousands are invited. In the case before us we may conceive something of the same kind. At any rate we cannot even imagine that all either could or would come. A general summons and a large audience from all classes meets the case. We are not required to place them in ranks directly before the door of the tabernacle, nor to include them all within the court. To demand this of us savours of cavilling and not of fair criticism. The bishop's calculations proceed on a basis of absurdity. Such as could come up to the door, would come; and such as could enter the court, would enter it; the rest would throng around externally and take part, by their mere attendance, in what was transacted. The miscellaneous confluence thus brought together would be immense, and if not before the door of the tabernacle with mathematical precision, as our Aristarchus demands, they could all say they attended; and a faithful historian could record that they were present. Under any circumstances we should designate as exceedingly small such an objection to any history. History is not often to be demonstrated fabulous by the rule of three.

The fifth chapter on "Moses and Joshua addressing all Israel," is of the same kind and value; "Moses and Joshua addressed all Israel," says the sacred history. They did not,

says the bishop, because without a miracle all Israel could not have heard them. Hence he concludes that the history is a fiction. Surely there is nothing which we have read more frequently than such things as "addressing the citizens of London," or "the general addressed the army," etc. But we know that the citizens did not all attend, and that the army was not all present and did not all hear. Yet we do not denounce such statements as fictions. Upon such an objection it is needless to enlarge.

"The extent of the camp compared with the priest's duties, and the daily necessities of the people," forms the next topic of debate. Our author here also stands with his measuring reed in his hand, and easily shews that the Mosaic narrative is not true. We deny his premises, not his arithmetic. The arithmetic we take for granted, but not the problem. If the ground he takes is correct, of course his conclusion will be irresistible, so far as each particular instance is concerned. But if the ground be not the true ground, if our objector starts from false premises, of necessity his conclusion falls to ruin. In the present instance we are particularly invited to turn our attention to Lev. iv. 11, 12, where the priest is required to carry out the whole of the bullock which has been slain at the door of the tabernacle (ver. 4). From verse 3, we learn that this bullock is a young bullock, offered as a sin-offering by the priest, who is to carry it out from the tabernacle to the outside of the camp where the ashes are poured out, there to burn it. The young bullock was probably a male calf, and the sacrifice a special one. A like victim and ceremony was enjoined as a sin-offering for the congregation. In both these cases the young bullock, minus the fat, was to be carried out and burnt. This is the first point.

The second point is that the people evidently had to carry out their ashes beyond the camp, probably as a sanitary measure.

A third point is that wood and water would have to be brought in from beyond the camp.

Bishop Colenso shews that these things were impossible. The camp, he says, must have been at least a mile and a half in diameter. If the tabernacle was in the centre, the priest would have had to carry "the bullock" at least three quarters of a mile, and the people would have had to carry their refuse a like distance. These things he affirms were impossible; and the impossibility is rendered more apparent by the case supposed in Deut. xxiii. 12—14. Herein, therefore, he finds "a very convincing proof of the unhistorical character of the whole narrative."

We shall have to examine his assumption that at that time

there were but three priests for all Israel. At present we simply remark that the priest may not have had literally himself to carry out the "young bullock," and that the people may not individually have had to carry out their own ashes. All that the narrative requires is that these things should be done by their direction. To ask for more is absurd, and mere cavilling. The other case, that of going without the camp for the necessities of nature, Dr. Colenso himself admits could not apply to all. And yet with strange perversity he makes it an argument for the unhistorical character of the narrative. There would assuredly be made provision for the execution of these laws by those to whom they were addressed, and no man in his senses ought to expect more. It seems, however, that we are to expect more, for on one supposition the camp was twelve miles square, and "we have to imagine the priest having himself to carry on his back, on foot, from St. Paul's to the outskirts of the metropolis, the . . . whole bullock," the people to carry out their rubbish in like manner, and to bring in their daily supplies of water and fuel, after first cutting down the latter where they could find it. Finally we have to imagine half a million of men going out daily—the twenty-two thousand Levites a distance of six miles, for the common necessities of nature. We have indeed to imagine all this, for the sacred narrative does not record them. If Dr. Colenso can shew that the priest had "himself to carry, on his back, on foot," a whole bullock, we will give up the question. There is not a word which says he had to do it. It is said the priest shall take the bullock (*i.e.*, the calf), except the fat, outside the camp, but it is not said that he shall carry it himself, and still less carry it on his back. The Hebrew word rendered "carry" is the *hiphil* of נָסַח, and a reference to any lexicon will shew that it means to cause to go forth, to convey, to produce, to bring out, and this might be done by any means or agency which the priest could command. Therefore it is not even said that the priest shall *carry* it at all, much less be a Jewish Milo of bull-carrying celebrity.

How often the sacrifice might have to be taken out we know not; neither do we know how often ashes, etc., were taken out, and fuel and water brought in. We cannot imagine that the Israelitish families were all their own dustmen, hewers of wood, and drawers of water. The remaining point, raised by Deut. xxiii. 12—14, we need not discuss, because upon the face of it it only applies to the armed men.

The seventh chapter is, "The number of the people at the first muster, compared with the poll-tax raised six months previously." The passage first quoted is Exod. xxx. 11—13,

and the first objection is to the expression, "the shekel of the sanctuary," which occurs in it. The Hebrew is "the shekel of holiness." Now the word shekel properly means a weight, like our word pound, and therefore the sense of the words will be "the holy shekel," as distinguished from a common shekel, for by a common Hebrew idiom, "shekel of holiness," "silver of holiness," etc., denote "holy shekel," "holy silver," etc. But Dr. Colenso takes the word "holiness" to signify "sanctuary," and he asks how could there be a shekel of the sanctuary before the sanctuary existed? He has a right to ask this question of course, and we have an equal right to propose a version which meets the difficulty, and which accords with common sense and good grammar. Like our "pound," the shekel was of two quantities at least, the holy shekel and the royal shekel, just as we have the pound troy and the pound avoirdupois. There is no evidence that the holy shekel drew its name from the Jewish sanctuary. The shekel itself was known in the time of Abraham, and its twofold amount may have been learned in Egypt.

We shall not consider the supposition that the name "shekel of holiness" was given by anticipation, nor that it was adopted when Moses finally completed the Pentateuch, nor that he explained to them what was meant. The amount is spoken of as one with which they were already familiar, and it cannot be proved to have derived its designation from the sanctuary which was not then erected.^d

This is not all that is objected to. It appears from Exod. xxxviii. 26, that 603,550 persons paid the above tribute or tax, where the bishop finds no mention of a census; but some months after this, a census was taken, and the number is again 603,550 (Numb. i. 46). Dr. Colenso's difficulty is that the two numbers are alike. We answer first, that Exod. xxxviii. 26 expressly says, "for every one *that went to be numbered* from twenty years old and upward," which looks very much like a census. Our second answer is, that the same persons went up some months later to be numbered according to their families. The first number gives the total, and the second divides them into classes. The fact that all the tribes, except Gad, give round numbers (hundreds, Gad has 45,650), shews that the census was rather an estimate than an exact and individual census.

^d There is a possibility that the words explanatory of the kind and value of the shekel are an interpolation. It might be argued, with much force, that the words were at least inserted by an editor, compiler, or copyist who lived after Moses. There is no reason to believe that Moses produced his autograph work on one roll of skin—it may have been like Sibylline leaves, on a multitude of pieces. When first reduced into a single volume, it may have suffered a little from editorial officiousness.

Besides which, all critics are perfectly aware that in the matter of numbers, there are more frequently than in any other case, (except perhaps in genealogies and lists of names,) reasons for regarding the Old Testament statements as open to criticism, and only at best mere approximations. We may owe this to the copyists, but it is a fact which we do not care to deny, without, however, abandoning our faith in the Bible, or fearing the cavils which the concession may induce.

The next argument is taken from the Israelites dwelling in tents (Exod. xvi. 16). Dr. Colenso cannot understand where the tents came from, nor how they were carried. The whole of the calculations in this chapter remind us of the drowning man who catches at straws. Surely two millions of people with skill in various trades, for they were not all brickmakers, would soon find the means for temporary shelter. Gradually they would become better lodged. Nor are we required to think their tents were so heavy as to need 200,000 oxen to carry them, for we do not know what the tents were made of. The only difficulties we here encounter are in the objector's own mind.^e

We are not disposed to treat the next objection much more seriously. It is founded on Exod. 13, 18, "The children of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt." The word rendered "harnessed" is an obscure one, and is rendered by Gesenius "the eager, active, brave, ready prepared," i.e., for fighting. Others have supposed it to mean in five divisions.^f Others again take the word to mean by five in a rank, or by fifty in a rank. This opinion has been maintained by some of the Jewish writers. Some of the ancient interpreters explain it to signify "girded." There is no reason to think it denotes any

^e We throw into a note the remark, that if the wilderness furnished small means for the skin tents which the bishop most unwarrantably and arbitrarily assumes, it furnished other materials. The brickmakers need not have made brick, but they may have constructed rude huts of stone in a vast number of cases and places, at the foot of the rocks, in the wadys, and elsewhere. These huts would be formed of the loose stones, which the bishop is at much pains to shew us were plentiful enough. Put together without mortar they would soon tumble to pieces, and except perhaps in some of the caves, we may now search in vain for traces of Israel in the wilderness. Along with the huts, in part or wholly of stone, would be many of all other materials which they could procure for the purpose. The stone huts would be rapidly thrown up on the march, would require but little attention while occupied, would soon fall to pieces when abandoned, and would not require any oxen for their removal. In their construction the Hebrew brickmakers and *builders* (as we gather from Exodus i. 11—14), would be just the men to engage, and to be successful. If it is objected that we are not told of these devices, it may be enough to affirm that we are not told that their tents were made of skins alone, or of skins at all. The word *succoth* merely means places of shelter, and anything in which the Israelites could hide their heads would be rightly named *succoth* (comp. Job xxxviii. 40).

^f Pococke is the first of the moderns whom we find advocating this view.

more than "in an orderly manner," as if in battle array, or like an army on the march. Such a mass of persons could not have been moved without some systematic arrangement. Upon such a word no argument can be founded. We may, and do believe, that the Israelites were not wholly without weapons of defence, or what might serve as such ; but this does not affect the question, which is, what the Hebrew word means in Exod. xiii. 18. It may shew the ambiguity of the word if we notice that the LXX. render it "in the fifth generation;" the Vulgate "armati;" and the Syriac "equipped." In any case the Bishop can make no weapon of the passage.

In the tenth chapter he considers the institution of the Passover (Exod. xii. 21—28.) He says the Israelites were instructed to keep the Passover, and did keep it in one single day ; which he sets down as impossible. Notice could not be given to the people ; they could not prepare for the ceremony ; and they could not perform it. The rigid arithmetic and criticism of the censor make no allowance for the fragmentary and brief character of the narrative. He assumes that all is said which was spoken, and that all is recorded which was done. We know not, perhaps, how to fill up all the outlines of the sketch, for we have not the skill of a Professor Owen to restore a complete animal from one broken bone. But we do know that in the narrative there is no impossibility which cannot be explained and shewn to consist in words. We do not know all the facts of the case, but we do know that the revolt of Israel was general and well organized ; that the people were on the watch for signals from their leaders, and that in such a case they would be able to learn, and ready to execute with unwonted rapidity, any commands which they received. As for questions, they are usually easier than answers ; and our modern Nicodemuses, with their "How can these things be?" think they have supplied the answer in the enquiry. We might answer, "We do not know ;" but our want of a better answer would only prove our ignorance of all the facts, and not that the record was false. Until we have seen the experiment tried we cannot say how long would be required to publish a law like that for the Passover, and to secure its obedience by a million or two of people circumstanced as Israel was at that moment.

We have more to say. In Exod. xii. 12, we find the Lord announcing the commencement of a new month of a new year. In verse 3, he charges Moses to tell the people that on the tenth of the month they shall take their lamb and keep it *till the fourteenth*, when they were to observe certain ceremonies, and eat the lamb as the Lord's Passover. In verse 12, we hear him say-

ing, “‘On this night’ I will pass through the land of Egypt,” etc. In verse 21 we find Moses giving the instructions to the people; and from what follows we learn that they were obeyed. Looking at these facts, we discover Dr. Colenso’s blunder. The law of the Passover was revealed on the first day of the month; and when, in verse 12, God says, “On this night,” the allusion is to the night of the fourteenth of the month, to which the ceremonies prescribed at verse 6 to verse 11 belong. Hence we gather that there were not *twelve hours* only for receiving, publishing and obeying the law, but more than as many days. Ten days would elapse before the lambs were provided, and four days more before they were killed and eaten. Dr. Colenso is quite aware that such an explanation may be given, but he does not take the trouble to discuss it. A few words in rather a depreciating tone are all it commands; and those who do not examine chapters xi. and xii., may believe with him that in xi. 4, the midnight next at hand is intended, and that “the story as it now stands, with the directions about ‘taking’ the lamb on the tenth day, and ‘keeping’ it till the fourteenth, are perplexing and contradictory.” In our view there is nothing perplexing and contradictory in the story as it now stands, but only in the story according to the version of it which the Bishop gives. The narrative distinctly allows fourteen or twenty days for events which we are told it ascribes to twelve hours. We can only express our surprise that any earnest student can have thought otherwise. This is our answer, and we have no fear in saying that it shivers to pieces the Colossus which the objector has erected.

As for the objection on the score of the borrowing of jewels, etc., we wholly deny the Bishop’s statement that it was at a moment’s notice. He himself is aware that the rule to borrow thus was given first in Exod. iii. 22, next in xi. 2; and that it was carried out is shewn by xi. 3. The record in xii. 35, 36, seems only to resume what has been already done, or at most to record a second act of liberality on the part of the Egyptians, who were now ready to pay them to go. We prefer to take the latter passage as a repetition of the previous statement. To make the sacred historian tells us that all this borrowing or begging took place on one day and at a moment’s notice, is to do violence to his words, and to impose upon them a sense which they refuse to bear. This is another token that the mind of the Bishop is rather that of the mathematician than of the critic; grant him his premises, and you must admit his conclusion. We usually find his premises to be wrong.

The objector next presses us with another calculation, (“he lisped in numbers, and the numbers came!”) to shew that the

number of lambs required for the Passover could not be provided. Not in twelve hours, we should say, but surely in ten days, by those who had the charge of the immense flocks of Egypt. We care nothing how many acres of ground would be required to pasture so large a number of sheep in Australia, New Zealand and Natal, because the question is about Egypt, or rather there is no question of the kind. The only question was how to procure in ten days the requisite number of lambs, and as Dr. Colenso has not asked this, neither do we.

“The march out of Egypt” is the subject of chap. xi. Here, again, we demur to the premises. It is assumed that the Israelites (Exod. xii. 37, 38) were “summoned to start, according to the story, at a moment’s notice, and actually started.” The argument is based upon the previous one; where we have shewn that there was at least fourteen days between the Passover law and the Passover. There may have been even a longer time between the announcement that the people should go, and their actual departure. Turning back to chap. xi., it will be seen that the Lord threatens the plague of the first-born, and promises the release of his people. This revelation was made known to Pharaoh, who still hardened his heart and refused to let the people go. *After* the events recorded in the eleventh chapter, Moses received from God the law of the Passover and the details above considered. We do not know how long the time was between the events related in chap. xi. 1, etc., and those commencing with the fourteen ante-paschal days in the twelfth chapter. In no case will Bishop Colenso’s argument hold, because his measure of time cannot be much above about one-twentieth part of that which we infer was actually afforded.

During these last fourteen days and upwards, all final preparations were made; and when the solemn hour arrived, doubtless all was ready, the signal was given, or ten thousand signals were given if necessary, and the mighty Exodus began. Shut out God from the affair, and make Moses everything, and you deny the reiterated declarations of the book. Jehovah was the supreme guide and the disposer of the events, and Moses and Aaron were but humble servants. He was the head and heart of the whole movement, and Israel in all ages has given Him the glory of bringing it to a successful issue. All hearts were at His command; all agencies at His disposition, and under His superintendence and inspiration that vast emigration was arranged and effected. This is the account given of the affair in the whole Bible, and in no respect does it agree with the petty calculations and the arithmetical exercises, the wretched word-splitting and the still more wretched exegesis of our objector.

It is almost enough to make us speak evil even of a Bishop, when we find him setting forth abortions of criticism so manifest, as real discoveries and evidence that the Pentateuch is not true. In all we have to say, we have nothing to do with the defence of expositors, but we have simply to shew that the new critic has failed to prove the cause inadequate to the effect.

But we pass on to "the sheep and cattle of the Israelites in the desert." This is rather a long chapter, but it is so occupied with a refutation of various statements by Canon Stanley and others, that our remarks upon it may be brief. And here, perhaps, though no law is directly in question, it will be as well to make an observation or two about the laws. First, that the laws of the Pentateuch were not given merely, or chiefly, in view of a life in the wilderness. Secondly, that very likely many of the laws were not put in force until the Israelites had entered Canaan: of some we know it was so. We offer as an illustration of our idea, and as a problem for solution, the cases involved in Exod. xiii. 5—10, and xiii. 11—16. Here we have instances in which the *regular* execution of important laws is in so many words postponed till the Israelites should come to Canaan. But observe, one of these laws is that of the PASSOVER, and the other that of the redemption of the first-born. Compare the laws in Exod. xxi., etc. The consequences of this principle are fatal to many of the objections of the bishop. He is right in saying the laws could not be observed in the wilderness; he is wrong in asserting that the story teaches that they were observed. It would probably be impossible now to ascertain precisely how many of the laws took effect before the land of Canaan was reached. Till then, we are compelled to believe that some were not kept at all, and others only occasionally. The laws were the code of Israel, designed for all the time of Israel's national life. The laws claimed God for their authority and author. Israel stood during their promulgation upon the threshold of the promised land; and the whole legislation, or at least nearly all, proceeds on the assumption that the people were about to enter Canaan. And so they were. But their sins excluded them year after year, and kept back the inheritance. At last, when the forty years were nearly gone, there is a republication of the laws, with some additions and such modifications as were required. There is not, we believe, the remotest trace of the observance in the wilderness of many of the laws. Nor is there the faintest intimation of the time when many of these laws were to take effect. We speak only of some and not of all the laws. Now the Pentateuch is confessedly not a perfectly detailed history of the forty years. Several of the great

landmarks of the period are indicated, and a number of special occurrences and general statements are given ; and we cannot in common honesty require any one to fill up the sketch in our day, or to account for the obscurities, or as some would call them, the imperfections and incongruities which it involves. The Pentateuch is not a minute journal, nor a logically arranged essay. The rabbins themselves, as we have seen, with all their veneration for it, never looked upon it even as a chronologically-ordered document. Neither rabbins nor Christians have been accustomed to consider the Mosaic laws, as a body, intended for the life in the wilderness, but for the future life of the nation. Some were, of course, for the wilderness, and so far special, or of immediate application ; but others, like an act of the British Parliament, did not come into operation till some time after publication.

We may now look at this question of the sheep and cattle in the wilderness, and notice that it is certainly true that Israel had herds and flocks in the wilderness. The books of Exodus and Numbers indicate as much (Exod. xii. 38 ; xxxiv. 3 ; Numb. xx. 4 ; xxxi. 9 ; xxxii. 26 ; may suffice to evince this). It is true that the indications contained in the historical passages referred to, belong to the beginning and the end of the forty years, and that during the intervening period we find few allusions to the actual existence of cattle. Where a record is silent for seven or eight and thirty years, it is of not much use to speculate. Our own impression is that the Israelites had flocks and herds during the whole period, although they may have had more at the first and towards the last than they had in the interval. We notice, for example, that after the celebration of the second passover, there are few traces of flocks and herds till just before the capture of those which the Midianites possessed. The people were meanwhile miraculously fed ; and through the whole of the transition or probationary time, they might have kept only such flocks and herds as were required for the necessary and imperative national and daily sacrifices. It is not unlikely that, except in the instances recorded, the Israelites generally did not observe even the passover itself in the wilderness. Even when the observance happened it may not have been universal. We refer again to Exod. xiii. 5—10. Peradventure it may seem a waste of time to discuss these points, but they have been raised, and they must be looked at. The very facts connected with the history of the Midianites in the Sinaitic peninsula, shew that they must have pastured flocks and herds on an extensive scale. It would be strange too, if a population so great as that of Israel, could not discover such

localities as were most fitted for their flocks and herds. We must not be silenced by the word "desert," nor even by the actual state of the peninsula. The Israelites were not always in a desert, nor even in a wilderness, although they were sometimes in one and sometimes in the other. The wilderness would furnish pasture for many cattle; the desert, not so.⁹ The wilderness of Sinai, and the deserts of the peninsula, may not have been at the Exodus just as we find them now. But in truth the whole matter is one of sheer speculation. First God's intervention is excluded; then it is assumed that the Israelites kept up vast flocks and herds all the forty years; then it is assumed that these flocks and herds could find nothing to eat and drink; and finally it is assumed that the record must be false. This is an inference from an assumption, and as such may be fairly thrown aside.

As for the discussion of Canon Stanley's remarks, it is merely a criticism in lawyer-like style; and as it deals with the Canon's explanations, we do not meddle with it:—to refute Dr. Stanley is one thing; and to refute Moses, another:—not that the Canon has much to suffer. The observations by and about Dr. Kalisch, also, we must pass over. Towards the close of the chapter, Bishop Colenso calls attention to the difficulty of finding firewood, as well as fodder. This is a difficulty which, like some others, may be real, but it is one which no impartial critic would urge. We do not know what the Israelites burned, we do not know how much they burned, and we do not know what agencies they had in operation for providing fuel as well as fodder. We do not know that they had two millions of sheep and oxen in the wilderness, neither do we think they had, although Bishop Colenso adopts that number, and by his arithmetic shews how many acres they must have covered. To these speculations we can only oppose some facts, sundry probabilities, and a good deal of ignorance.

"The number of the Israelites compared with the extent of the land of Canaan," is discussed in chapter thirteen. It is supposed that the land was not large enough for the people. This is nothing but a supposition, and one which is bolstered up by a comparison of the actual population of Natal, and of certain English counties, as Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex. We confess our inability to find any argument in the chapter.

"The number of the first-borns (*sic*) compared with the number of male adults," is the question of the next chapter.

⁹ The very word translated 'wilderness' and 'desert' is applicable to any uncultivated district. The Israelites sojourned both in the wilderness and the desert.

According to Numb. iii. 43, the first-born males amounted to 22,273. This number is said to be too small. Here the question of the numbers comes up again, and we can only repeat that numbers are not always accurate. Copyists may have erred, and have erred in regard to numbers more frequently perhaps than in other things. We may fairly suppose that 900,000 of the Israelites were males; we may further suppose that 300,000 of these were under twenty years of age, and that the 22,273 were part of them. But even on this principle the first-born will be less than one in thirteen. This is of course possible, and even probable if we admit the practice of polygamy, and assume the first-born sons to have been such on the father's side. Dr. Colenso objects to this, and demands that the first-born of the mothers should be understood. His proof from Numb. iii. 12, does not bear him out. The case is one of confessed difficulty, and we are not prepared with an explanation which we can rely upon. We will therefore leave it with another hypothesis,—that the 22,273 first-born were only those who had been born in the wilderness and after the Exodus, or even after the encampment at Sinai. A conclusion connected with this case by Dr. Colenso is simply monstrous—that instead of more than 600,000 warriors, or men capable of bearing arms, there were not more than 2000. For if we suppose that the number 22,273 represents one-fourth of all the males of all ages, we shall have almost 100,000, and of them it would be absurd to fancy that only 2000 could bear arms. How the 2000 are arrived at by another process, it will be time enough to consider when we come to it.

In Exod. xii. 40 we read that the Israelites sojourned in Egypt 430 years. This is an old question, and it is now commonly admitted that the 430 years include the sojourn in Canaan and in Egypt, as is stated in some versions, and intimated in Gal. iii. 17. Dr. Colenso says nothing in this chapter requiring particular remark; he seeks to shew that it was 210 or 215 years that Israel was actually in Egypt.

The sixteenth chapter, on "The Exodus in the Fourth Generation," is really connected with the preceding. Having shewn that the Exodus occurred 210 or 215 years after Jacob went into Egypt, he proceeds to shew that the Exodus was in the fourth generation. For ourselves, we say it was, and it was not; if by a generation we understand not a certain period, but a descent. Thus we have Levi, Kohath, Amram, and Moses, that is, four generations or descents. Nor is there any doubt that (omitting Jacob) many of the fourth generation went out of Egypt. But besides these there were men of the fifth and

sixth generations, to go no further. Dr. Colenso would omit Jacob's sons in the reckoning, and regard Moses, for instance, as of the third generation. We know well enough that persons of the fifth and later generations of those born in Egypt went out at the Exodus. Thus we have Pharez, Hezron, Caleb, Hur, Uri, Bezaleel, where we have six names in regular descent without counting Judah and Jacob, who preceded them. Dr. Colenso starts this chapter by quoting Gen. xv. 16, where it is foretold that Israel shall return in the fourth generation. As a matter of fact, we know that in Abraham's time a generation might mean a hundred years. With us it is commonly taken to mean about one-third as much. The chapter in which this subject of the fourth generation is considered is weak, and by itself rather like an example of captious criticism. For instance, in quoting Gen. l. 23, the author very feebly touches on the notice that Joseph lived to see Ephraim's children of the *third* generation. Yet Joseph died about seventy years after Jacob came into Egypt. If there were a third or a fourth generation then, there may have been a ninth or a tenth at the Exodus, as shewn by 1 Chron. vii. 22—27, which our author quotes, but cannot nullify. We must not, however, commit ourselves to the many small details of this chapter.

Probably the previous point is intended to clear the way for the next, in which another old question—that of the amazing increase of the Israelites in Egypt—is discussed. The problem is to explain how the sixty to seventy persons who entered Egypt could have multiplied so immensely: or rather, how the sons and grandsons of Jacob, *with their wives* (who went into Egypt and are not counted), could have so multiplied. As we have no new theory upon this subject, and it has been so often canvassed, we shall not discuss it.

There are, nevertheless, many things in the chapter which will expose the author to very severe criticism. He labours to the utmost to shew that Jacob had only sixty-nine or seventy descendants when he went out of Egypt. By an ingenious calculation he proves that the males at the Exodus could have been only 4923; and by another ingenious calculation he proves that they could have been only 1377. The female members of Jacob's family at the migration to Egypt are made the smallest number possible. It is supposed that Jacob's descendants did not to any considerable extent intermarry with the heathen. The allusions of the narrative to the vast rapidity with which the Israelites increased are all lost sight of. And so by dilution and sleight of hand the story is made to appear absurd. We demand allowances for Jacob's sons' wives and grandsons' wives,

and in general a natural proportion of females. We may ask if there were no men-servants and maid-servants. Our own conviction is, that the actual number who went to Egypt (including Joseph's family) must have been nearer 140 than 70. Jacob's own descendants had in fifty or sixty years increased to sixty-seven males. How many females there were we know not. The whole matter is one of the curiosities of criticism. The utmost that Bishop Colenso will allow is, that the sum total of the males of all generations "could not according to these data" have exceeded 28,465. As we have said, however, we cannot go now into this objection to the Pentateuch; neither will we enter into its branches, although the eighteenth chapter is devoted to the number of the Danites and Levites at the Exodus. We have said over and over again that some of the separate numbers may not be exact. But we nevertheless gather from the reasons which have been given by so many, that there is good ground for believing the general statement.

Chapter nineteen continues the subject of the gross total of the Israelites, and for the present must be passed over.

Chapter twenty treats of the number of priests at the Exodus compared with their duties, and the provision made for them. Their duties were multifarious, but their number, says Dr. Colenso, was exactly *three*. We reply that there were only three principal priests, but the actual number who performed priestly duties was much greater, if we are not greatly mistaken. Just as it is said in the rubrics of certain places of the Prayer Book, "the priest" shall do such and such things, when, as a matter of fact, they may be done by a deacon. Nor is there anything wrong in this, for the deacon is ordained to be an assistant to the priest. So doubtless in old times, when the actual priests were few, the Levites rendered them constant and important aid.

There is great danger in such pursuits as that in which such gentlemen as Dr. Colenso are engaged, and it may be in our own, lest disputants should endeavour, as Butler says—

"To pass for deep and learned scholars,
Although but paltry Obs and Sollers."

The worst of it is, that in Dr. Colenso's book we find all Obs and no Sols.

He says there were but three priests, and they could not do all that was required of them. We say, suppose there were but three priests, they had the assistance of an army of Levites, who could aid them, and would act under their direction. No man would deny the truth of the history which recorded how

Admiral Vernon took Porto Bello with six ships only. Every one would understand that Admiral Vernon must have had men and guns, and gunpowder, etc. No one will deny that Sir Christopher Wren built St. Paul's, although as a matter of fact he did not lay a stone nor drive a nail. But is it the case that there were literally but three priests in the wilderness? In a vague sense the Israelites were all priests (Exod xix. 6), but in the strictest, Aaron and his sons alone were priests, if we are to hear our objector, who refers for proof to Numb. iii. 10, 38. These passages affix the priestly office to Aaron and his sons, and threaten the stranger who intrudes into that dignity with death. Now who was the stranger? Dr. Benisch is not far from the mark when he translates the word "layman." Beyond question it means any unauthorized person. And yet the rules for sacrifices leave it undoubted that many things had to be done by those who brought their offerings. It further appears that while the general duties of the Levites are specified, they were very much at the discretion of the presiding priests. There is a noticeable phraseology which often occurs calculated to force upon us the conviction that the word priest was applied to others than Aaron and his sons. What we refer to is, that in passages where it is said first "the sons of Aaron" shall do certain things, and where it is added of part of the ceremony, "and the priest" shall do, etc., this fairly suggests that besides the sons of Aaron there were others who were popularly, at least, called priests, and who assisted in priestly functions. Many examples of this kind occur in Leviticus. If there were but two or three priests, they could not have done what the bishop says they had to. And besides the provision which was made for the priests would have been preposterous had there been but three. All this we readily admit.

We have already suggested that many of the laws were not carried into effect in the wilderness, as Dr. Colenso supposes, and if our argument is good, his objection on that head falls to the ground. Such a law is that requiring the offering of turtle doves or young pigeons. If not offered, they need not be provided.

The next objection respecting the "priests and their duties at the celebration of the passover," is of the same kind, and admits of the same answer in part. There is an apparent difficulty in the case, which is, how so many lambs could be killed, and their blood sprinkled upon the altar, in the course of a few hours. We can only imagine that in practice, a solution of this difficulty was found which adhered to the spirit if not to the letter of the law. This is a question, however, which is founded upon an anachronism. We have no indication that

such customs were observed at the passover in the wilderness (Numb. ix. 4, 5), and the Bishop is compelled to rest his argument entirely upon records relating to a time when the system of the temple was established (2 Chron. xxx. 16; xxxv. 11).

In his twenty-second chapter, the Bishop touches upon some other matters, and boldly speaks of the inconsistencies and impossibilities of the Pentateuch. He tells us that "It is plain that in its own essential statements of matters of fact, the narrative of the Exodus is full of contradictions." He concludes that his objections "make it impossible for a thoughtful person to receive, without further inquiry, any considerable portion of it *as certainly true* in an historical point of view." Such are his opinions. He refuses to allow that there may be some error in the Hebrew numerals. He accuses Moses of not being a good arithmetician, or rather, he leads us to see that in his view, Moses wrote no part of the Pentateuch. He forces upon us the conviction, that he esteems it altogether a much more recent production, an historical fiction, and not a real history. All this he does as a solemn religious duty.

The slaughter of the Midianites, recorded in Numb. xxxi., is passed under review, and under the pressure of arithmetic breaks down of course. In like manner, it is shewn that there is not sufficient time for certain events. These matters we must leave untouched, as we have already given specimens sufficient of the arguments of this strange book.

The concluding chapter involves a variety of remarks which are natural enough from one who has given so many proofs that he does not believe the Pentateuch true. For if it be not true, how can it be inspired in any proper sense? Reason and conscience, to which so confident an appeal is made, will, we fear, prove blind guides if left alone, or if not under the guiding influence of that faith which has lasted so long, and wrought such marvels, under the influence of a Bible as a whole. We are afraid to think that the "noble words of Cicero," and the revelations made to the Sikh Gooroos by the same divine teacher, and the revelations made to the Brahmins, and all like revelations, will be found a poor substitute for the Bible, and miserable helpers of it. The man who can appeal to such things as specimens of the kind of inspiration in which he believes, is too far gone for us to reach him. He is avowedly ready to take up as his hymn the wretched strain of Pope,—

"Father of all, in every age,
By every clime adored,
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord."

Must he not go further? Inexorable logic will compel him to recognize more than the inspiration of Cicero, and Sikhs and Brahmins. He may be driven to adopt some pitiable dream of universalism, and to accept all religions as equally true, inspired, and divine. Between ourselves and such a man there is a great gulf fixed, and one which no arithmetical problems will ever enable us to cross. We tremble for the responsibility of a man who addresses such things to men inclined to unbelief; and who promises we know not how much more of the same kind. Surely this is to offer strange fire upon the altar, and strange fire kindled by sacerdotal hands.

Russian Buildings at Jerusalem.—The following account of the works that are at present being carried on by the Russians in Jerusalem, taken from a letter recently received from the Rev. J. Barclay, will be read with interest:—

“In a former letter, you ask me to give you some information about the Russian buildings at the north-west side of the city. The site occupied by them incloses an area of about 157,500 square yards, or 1,417,500 square feet; in fact, an irregular parallelogram, 350 yards broad and 450 yards long. The ground on which they stand is surrounded by a wall about fifteen feet high. The buildings comprise a palace for a bishop, a magnificent cathedral which is being rapidly pushed towards completion, and large quadrangular buildings, intended for the accommodation of many hundreds of pilgrims. In the plan which I have seen, many other edifices are also designed, the object of which I do not clearly know. The land itself was partly purchased by the Russians, though the larger portion, which was the former Turkish military exercise ground, was granted to them by imperial firman. Their outlay cannot be set down at less than £250,000, about a quarter of a million, and yet their object is not fully realized. The idea which originated these buildings arose, it is said, in the Grand Duke Constantine’s mind, just after the Crimean war. To supply the place of the Russian navy, which had been interdicted in the Black Sea, it was proposed to keep in movement a large number of transport steamers as passenger boats. To keep these going, an impetus was given to the public mind on the subject of pilgrimage. With a view of supplying lodging for the crowds of devotees, a subscription list was opened, and its proceeds applied to the commencement of the present erections. It was then proposed to make arrangements to convey pilgrims at so much per head, from the several ports in Russia, to and from Jerusalem, at a fixed tariff. Amongst the items set down was a definite sum for the absolution of each penitent in the holy places. At this proposition the Greek priests raised the cry of sacrilege, as such fees heretofore had been peculiarly their own; but now it was proposed to employ none but Russian priests. The Holy Synod took the matter up, and after a good deal of the usual intrigue, the direction of the whole passed into its hands. The location of the buildings is not far from the upper Pool of Gihon, near which Rabshakeh stood when he defied Hezekiah. It commands also the north and west of the city, and if we are to credit Latin suspicion, its future use will be military.”—*Jewish Intelligencer*.

THE PROTESTANT CLERGY IN BOHEMIA.

THE year 1863 is likely to be a memorable and important one in the religious history of the Slavonic nations. It is the thousandth anniversary of the arrival of Cyrillus and Methodius, the two brothers of Thessalonica, among them as heralds of the Gospel, and is about to be observed as a grand jubilee and religious festival in Bohemia, Moravia, and the adjoining Slavonic districts. As English Protestants, as venerating Wycliffe the first translator of the Scriptures into the English tongue, the readers of *The Journal of Sacred Literature* will, we trust, not object to find an account of the Bohemian clergy, the descendants of Huss, and through him of Wycliffe, placed before them.

The Bohemian Protestants are divided into two confessions, the Reformed or Helvetian Confession, and the Evangelical or that of Augsburg. The former are in the eye of the law considered Zwinglians, but do not derive their traditions from the Swiss reformers, but from their own direct ancestors, the Hussites and Bohemian brethren. The latter are identical with the German Lutherans. But the pecuniary and social position of their clergy is much the same as that of the reformed.

The incomes of the Bohemian pastors vary, but are on the whole very small. Compare them with those of the English clergy, and their smallness is scarcely credible; and even after an Austrian standard, if we consider the receipts of government officials and the incomes of the Roman Catholic clergy, one cannot but be surprised at the poorness of the pecuniary condition of the Bohemian Protestant clergy; and can scarcely understand how, with their usually numerous families, they are able to exist at all. One of those who enjoy the highest stipend at present known, said to us, after giving us an account of his income, "You see, it is a wonder that I exist at all, and it is only by God's mercy that I am able to do so, and yet here you see me, and I have brought up my family, consisting of one son and three daughters."

There is a triple scale of payment; first and lowest, 120 florins=240 francs=£12, with some small addition in kind in the way of butter, flax, kitchen stuff, and a little firewood; the latter only in mountainous districts. Second comes a salary of 200 florins=£16 13s. 4d., to which in some places is added from eight to ten pecks of corn, and some firewood. The third and highest point of the scale averages 300 florins=£25, with some corn and firewood; but that only in a few congregations. Of late the firewood and corn have sometimes been converted

into money and added to the fixed income, which then amounts at the highest to 500 florins = £42 13s. 4d. But this is a maximum only attained in a few wealthy congregations; and the majority of the pastors receive according to the first and second classes of the scale. To this must be added the surplice-fees (*stola*), which vary, but cannot be taken at a higher average than 200 florins (£16 13s. 4d.), and in many congregations are very much less. One clergyman estimated his fees to us at about 40 florins or £3 6s. 8d.

A Bohemian clergyman, now in Prussia, but who has just accepted a call to a small village in his native country, writes to us that he can point out a well-known work, which will illustrate the position of the poor Protestant clergy in Bohemia, *The Vicar of Wakefield*. "There," says he, "is depicted a true pastor of souls struggling with poverty and a difficult social position, yet conscientiously fulfilling his duty as a father and as a minister; it is the prototype of a genuine country parson! Ecclesiastical circumstances in England have changed for the better, as you have yourself informed me, so that the unfortunate relation between the beneficed clergy and their curates has ceased to exist, since no one may now hold more benefices than he can manage himself. While in England such instances belong to the class of rarities or have almost passed into oblivion, similar cases among the Bohemian pastors are of frequent occurrence up to the present day; and ministers who have to struggle with care for their daily bread, and much anxiety for the maintenance of their families, are but too often found. A clever writer could make a book like *The Vicar of Wakefield* out of the history of almost every Protestant clergyman's family. There would be no want of touching family scenes and original episodes in the life of the country pastors, but the same thread that we find in that work would run through the whole, viz., the struggle for physical existence. But neither would there be any deficiency of instances of Christian patience and humility, or of firm trust in God; for God be praised, true fear of him is still to be found in the families of the Protestant clergy of Bohemia."

A clergyman's widow after her husband's death receives only about 30 florins (£2 10s.) from the Clergymen's Widows' Fund, and is in other respects thrown on the sympathy and benevolence of the congregation. "I have," says our correspondent, "met many such widows, who went from parsonage to parsonage collecting gifts of charity, in order thus to prolong their lives for a time." The daughters of such widows are often obliged to go out as maid-servants and nursery maids, partly for want of education high enough for them to be received into wealthy

houses as governesses, and partly because the higher classes entertain a prejudice against them because of their religion; as the Catholic clergy treat Protestants in such families as heretics. Such is the lot of the widows and orphans of the Protestant clergy in Bohemia.

Let us now consider the questions of the origin of this extreme poverty, and the best means of getting rid of it. One principal cause is the precarious relation of the pastors to their congregations. There are no private patrons, *e.g.*, landowners and the like, but the congregation possesses the right of presenting to every incumbency. The Bohemian nobility, which was mainly Protestant, was partly destroyed, partly driven from the country after the battle of the White Mountain in 1620. Thus, although it had formerly been the great prop of Protestantism, after the promulgation of the Edict of Toleration by the Emperor Joseph II., in 1781, there was no relic left of any such support. For though more than 50,000 of the common people immediately declared themselves Protestants, yet scarcely any member of the old Bohemian aristocracy returned to the faith of his ancestors. The few noble families that profess the evangelical religion, have almost all immigrated lately from Germany. Never, perhaps, was a more striking instance than in Bohemia in 1781 of the truth of our Lord's words, "To the poor is the Gospel preached."

The disadvantages of the fact that no wealthy nobility is at the head of the Protestant movement are two; viz., want of support, and too great dependence of the clergy upon their flocks. In many respects the relation between the pastors and their congregations is really patriarchal and beautiful, but in many material matters of practical life it is painful and disagreeable. The congregations are obliged to support their own churches, schools, clergymen, and school teachers, and that not out of settled church funds, but entirely by their own personal contributions. Among the disabilities to which the Protestants were subjected under the Patent of Toleration, viz., that they might not exercise their religion publicly, might not have regular churches with towers, bells, and lofty windows, but only simple chapels, etc., was this serious disadvantage, that they might not possess any proper church property, inasmuch as they had no corporate rights. Their only mode of meeting their ecclesiastical necessities was by means of the contributions of the individual members of the congregation, which were regulated in proportion to the property of each. From the same source came the salaries of the clergy; and from the fact that everything had to come out of the pockets of the congregation, it is easy to

understand how it was that the salaries of the clergy were set so low.

Of late matters have altered for the better. The law affecting the Protestants, of April 8, 1861, has put an end to the previous disabilities, and granted corporate rights to the evangelical churches. They are now allowed to possess and acquire church property. The government even subsidizes the Protestants out of the treasury. It gives an income of 4000 florins (£333 6s. 8d.) to the superintendents (bishops), and an addition of 200 florins (£16 13s. 4d.) to the seniors (rural deans or archdeacons), and a small sum to assist the congregations as regards their general requirements. But the grand difficulty in bettering the condition of the generally poverty-stricken pastors is, that the congregations are entirely ignorant of the proper standard of measurement for the payment of their clergy; and as the peasant-farmers, cottagers, and day-labourers, have a share in the patronage of benefices, they cannot easily from their position understand that, in order to live decently like a government official of his own class, a clergyman requires twice or three times as much as he has hitherto been in receipt of. In their simple-heartedness many of these people believe that the clergyman should live in apostolic simplicity, and therefore a higher scale of payment would only do harm. Hence arises also a certain jealousy, especially on the part of wealthy peasant-farmers. They are accustomed to see the clergyman below and not above them in a pecuniary point of view, and suspect that, if he were put in a better position, he would become too genteel or even proud. Hence comes a fatal dependence on the congregation, which is very oppressive to a well-educated man, who is conscious of his position and high calling. The times require, that the clergyman should be emancipated from this thralldom, and become independent. But how is this to be effected? One way would be to form a general fund for the payment of the clergy; but there are two reasons which would seem to make this less practical than at first sight it might appear. First is the precarious condition of the Austrian finances, and the variations in the value of the greatly depreciated paper currency in that empire. Secondly, the collection and formation of such a general fund would take too much time before a commencement could be made with the actual payment of the salaries.

The safest and surest method is the acquisition of land, whether the clergyman farms it himself or whether he lets it. Individual congregations have already made a beginning in this direction. They capitalize the annual contributions destined for the support of the clergyman and purchase land, and thus

release themselves from ever-recurring contributions, while at the same time the clergyman obtains a more independent position. The most important point now is, that the land thus purchased should be bought in sufficient quantity for the purpose. To this end any assistance given by foreign brethren might advantageously be applied. Some pastors have betaken themselves in their distress to the Gustavus Adolphus Society in Germany, and have frequently received temporary assistance, especially from ladies' societies. But every respectable man must feel, that support of such a kind is scarcely suitable to the position of a clergyman. It is far better to purchase real property, and pay the clergy out of it.

The best method would therefore appear to be, that such congregations as are blessed with energetic clergymen and presbyteries at their head, should gradually acquire landed property, and out of the annual proceeds pay both their clergyman, and, if possible, their schoolmaster also, in a creditable and respectable manner. These congregations should also be assisted by the contributions of brethren in the faith. "*Verba movent, exempla trahunt*," says our Bohemian friend. When other congregations see the object attained in this way, they will gradually begin to imitate the good example, and even the less zealous will be drawn away by the current. No doubt the Gustavus Adolphus Society would also assist in the work, but not to any very great extent, as its grand aim and object is to build churches and schools, and to provide the brethren in the "diaspora" with pastors and teachers.

"But," continues our Bohemian friend, "perhaps some aid towards the furtherance of the good cause may be hoped from England, where a consolidated and well-ordered church is already in existence; England, zealous England, which I for my part hold to be the chief prop and support of Protestantism. There the connexion between Wycliffe and Huss may perhaps awaken sympathy for the fate of the Bohemian Protestants, at a time when among the latter the sun of religious freedom has again just begun to rise; and there is good hope that the true Gospel will obtain victory after victory. *Quod Deus facere velit.*"

One of the most remarkable circumstances in the condition of the really Bohemian or Czeskish Protestants, is their great knowledge of the Scriptures; and another is the entire absence of all signs of rationalism from the preaching of their clergy. We once had the pleasure of hearing an excellent discourse from the minister of the Helvetian congregation at Prague, Mr. Schubert, of which we made an abstract, which may not be unacceptable to our readers. It was preached in the Bohemian

or Czeskish dialect of the Slavonic, and may be taken as a fair specimen of that gentleman's preaching. The Helvetian congregation at Prague has doubled its numbers in the last thirteen years.

The text was John iv. 35. "Say not ye, there are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest? Behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest."

After an introduction, descriptive and explanatory of the preceding conversation with the woman of Samaria, the preacher entered upon the subject of the text. Christ, he said, spake not of an earthly harvest, which would not have arrived for the next four months, but of a spiritual harvest, which was almost ready, and for which the fields were already white. In a harvest there were four things to notice :

(1.) The Lord of the harvest.

(2.) The field.

(3.) The reapers and other work-people.

(4.) The barn in which the corn is finally collected.

(1.) The Lord of the spiritual harvest is God, the Lord of heaven and earth, and the giver of all good. The lord of an earthly harvest is careful, active and prudent in managing all, and seeing that everything is done at its proper time. The master's eye is everywhere, superintending and looking after all. So too the Lord of the spiritual harvest exercises a constant and watchful providential superintendence over his people.

(2.) The field, according to its soil, or the soil of different portions of it, bears different kinds of grain. These correspond to the different ranks of men which are found upon the earth. On cultivated land we find in one part wheat, in another rye, in another oats, and so forth. But the same Lord owns and cares for all in their several places, and at their several times. All are alike his property, and the wheat has no right to set itself up above the rye, or to despise the other kinds of corn which have a less market value. Neither ought the others to envy the wheat. So too all ranks of men ought to live contentedly together in the several spheres which God's providence has assigned them.

Weeds also grow in the field of the earthly harvest, and endeavour to choke and otherwise injure the legitimate crop. So too evil men endeavour to do harm in the world, the field of the spiritual harvest. God grant that the weeds may not become too powerful in the portion of the field occupied by the congregation then addressed !

Attacks had lately, he regretted to say, been made upon the

Jews in the town of Prague. But people should consider that those Jews also were one of the many kinds of grain belonging to the Lord of the harvest; neither had anybody but He a right to interfere violently with them. They should let them alone till the end came, when God would dispose of them as should seem good in his sight.

(3.) The work-people employed in the harvest. These were reapers, binders, carriers, gleaners, etc. Those who preceded Christ had been the sowers. Christ and the apostles reaped the crop; and such was also the work of those who went as missionaries into heathen lands. The binders were the larger and smaller congregations in Christian lands, and their respective ministers. Every one was more or less called upon to join in the work, neither could any one escape from that responsibility. Yet the true and zealous workmen were always and everywhere too few. The special field assigned to the members of that congregation was the large and populous town of Prague, where there was abundance to do. Lord, grant us, said he, thy Holy Spirit, that no slothful and indolent work-people may be found amongst our number!

(4.) The barn. The corn was brought, weeds and all, into the barn, where it was separated from them. Even so were good and bad collected together in the visible church. Even in this life, through education, preaching, the sacraments, the operation of the Holy Ghost, etc., there was a certain separation between the good and the bad. But the final and permanent separation did not take place till the last day, when the books would be opened, and each would receive his sentence according to the deeds done in the body. And a great part of the sentence would depend upon men's conduct towards their neighbours. "Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it, or did it not, to the least of these, ye did it, or did it not, unto me." May we all here present, said he in conclusion, then stand at the right hand and hear the blessed words, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom which has been prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

The above, of which we have endeavoured to give an outline, which cannot reproduce the animated voice and gestures and the striking fervour of the preacher, who amply vindicated his right to the title of a "fiery orator," which we had heard applied to him, is certainly an excellent discourse. Neither can we see anything to criticize in it, except the assignment of the sowing to those who preceded Christ, to whom we should rather have attributed the preparation of the ground for the great sower, Christ himself. On hearing this sermon we were not at all

surprised at the increase of the congregation, nor at the size and attention of the audience in the church; half of whom were unable to find seats, and many of whom were Roman Catholics.

We have thus endeavoured to lay before the English public the real state of the Protestant clergy in Bohemia, partly from our own knowledge, and partly from sources for which we can vouch. We must now leave the result in the hands of God and our brethren in the churches of Protestant Britain. May he grant that our voice thus raised may find an echo in the hearts of many!

A. H. W.

Discoveries at Pompeii.—The house upon which the workmen are at present (Aug. 9, 1862) engaged is of considerable extent. It displays an average amount of the ordinary decoration which prevails in middle-class Pompeian houses; and it also presents on its outer walls several of those curious electioneering addresses in which Pompeian candidates, or their friends, were wont to appeal to the municipal electors. It was not, however, until yesterday that the expectations and consequent vigilance of the excavators were raised beyond the ordinary degree. In a corner of one of the inner rooms was found a heap of silver and copper coins, to the number of above 500. They had seemingly been tied up together in a little bag, which, however, has entirely disappeared; and at first they were agglutinated into a mass, although they have since been separated without difficulty. At the same time, and near the same spot, were found two large shears or scissors, and soon afterwards a house-mill of the ordinary description, together with a little heap of corn, the grains blackened indeed and somewhat shrivelled, but yet fully preserving their shape and very little diminished in size. Even if these indications had not sufficiently pointed out the house as a baker's establishment, all doubt was removed this morning by the discovery in the next apartment, not only of the metal scoop or shovel with which the loaves were placed in the oven, but also of the oven itself, the mouth of which was closed with a large iron door, not attached by hinges, but simply, as at present, cemented at the edges to the faces of the four large slabs which formed the mouth of the oven. At the moment when, in company with the courteous and accomplished director, I entered the bakehouse, the workmen were in the act of endeavouring to remove the iron door, but one of the handles gave way in the attempt. A little patience and care, however, overcame the difficulty, and it was no sooner withdrawn than we were rewarded with the sight of *the entire batch of loaves, such as they were deposited in the oven seventeen hundred and eighty-three years ago.* There are eighty-two in number, and are all, so far as regards form, size, and indeed every characteristic except weight and colour, precisely as they came from the baker's hand. When it is remembered that up to the present time but two such loaves had been discovered, one of them imperfect, the interest of this discovery will be fully appreciated. I ought to add, however, that, unlike the loaf in the Museo Borbonico, which is stamped *SPILIGO . CRANII . E . CICER .*, these loaves have no maker's name or other mark. They are circular, about nine inches in diameter, rather flat and indented (evidently with the elbow) in the centre; that they are slightly raised at the sides, and divided by deep lines radiating from the centre into eight segments. They are of a deep brown colour, and hard, but exceedingly light.

C. W. RUSSELL, *in the Athenæum.*

REUSS' " HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY."

AMIDST the conflict of theological systems and the din of controversy, many an honest student, anxious to find some sure footing, has made the attempt to construct a system for himself from the materials supplied by the Bible alone. The authority of Holy Scripture being allowed on all hands, the enterprize would be apparently one of great promise. Not only would it end the weary researches of the theologian himself, but there might be a hope that a body of divinity once constructed from such sources, might meet with something like a general acceptance, and go far to heal the divisions of the churches. Time after time disappointment has followed; the pen has dropped from the hand of the writer, or the labour of his life, instead of appeasing controversialists, has but furnished fresh fuel for discussion and criticism. It is indeed not an easy matter to free oneself so entirely from preconceived ideas, and from the desire to find things correspond to our own accustomed doctrine, as to be able to perform the task with thorough fairness. Subjective reasoning or traditional authority creeps in unawares, and the theology which was to be purely Biblical loses its title to that character and becomes scholastic. Theology, as generally understood, is the product of human reason, the result of human reflection on the original Gospel, and so necessarily a *development* of that Gospel. The Reformers themselves only substituted one scholastic system for another, and Scripture was appealed to, not so much as the source as the support and proof of theology. Then succeeded attempts to arrange the actual texts of Scripture under heads. The texts were taken indiscriminately from all parts of the Bible, and whilst some writers tried to collect the greatest possible number to prove each point, others picked out what each author had contributed to the system, or laboured to shew how the whole of theology was contained in Jeremiah or Job. This plan, still thoroughly scholastic in its essence, was opposed by the pietists, and in 1756 a work was published by Ant. Büsching, entitled *Epitome Theologiæ e solis sacris literis concinnatæ et ab omnibus rebus et verbis Scholasticis Purgatæ*. The most notable works of a similar character that have been published since that date appear to be those of G. L. Bauer (1796—1804), De Wette (1813—31), and Hofmann (1852). The same radical defect has accompanied all these attempts, the starting with a system ready made, and forcing all parts of the Bible to fit into it. Reuss in his *History*

of Christian Theology,^a pursues a different plan. He confines himself to the New Testament, and his method is purely historical. He takes each author separately, and allows a distinct system to grow, as it were, under his hands out of the materials before him. His object is not to prove a theology, nor to reconcile the differences which may rise to the surface between different writers, but simply to ascertain what each had to say. We think that he has performed his task with eminent ability and impartiality; but the work has not met with much notice in England, though mentioned with approval, and frequently referred to by the Dean of Exeter (now Bishop of Gloucester) in his commentary on St. Paul's Epistles.

There is nothing in Reuss' method of enquiry which need shock the prejudices of any. That the writers of the New Testament differ, if not in doctrine, at least in tone and style, must be allowed by all. Every reader of the Bible unconsciously confesses this, when he chooses one part in preference to another for his own meditations. Luther's low opinion of the Epistle of St. James is well known and often quoted, and is a sufficient proof, if any be needed, of the great apparent opposition between two principal writers of the New Testament. By bringing out distinctly the peculiar ideas of each author from his own point of view, we do not in any degree prejudge the question of a harmony between them all; possibly we may be taking the surest way to establish that harmony. But whatever results from our investigation, no Protestant can consistently deny the propriety of ascertaining the true sense of Scripture by the most accurate process of enquiry that can be applied to it. It must be remembered also, that if the work be unfairly or inadequately done, it carries with it its own refutation; the original sources are open and accessible to all. Yet further, it will after all be only too easy to find some mode of harmonizing the results with the previous conclusions of individual reasoning or church authority. The ease with which this may be done, and the certainty that it will be done, may be regarded with satisfaction or with despair. Some may be reassured by the possible reinstatement of their own previous system; others disappointed that traditional belief or individual prejudice should prove so unassailable.

Reuss' work is divided into six books. In the first he gives an account of Judaism at the time of Christ; in the second, of the teaching of our Lord himself; in the next three books, of the three phases of apostolical doctrine; 1, legal; 2, combatant;

^a *Histoire de la Theologie Chrétienne au Siècle Apostolique.* Par Edouard Reuss. Strasbourg, 1852.

3, independent; and in the sixth book, of the results in the first century. For different reasons we shall pass over the first two books, and confine our observations mainly to the three following. In the introduction to the third book, Reuss gives an explanation of the variations of apostolical teaching. The common opinion is that the disciples of Jesus were imbued with divers prejudices and errors, as indeed is evident from the account of the evangelists, but that on the day of Pentecost they received in a miraculous manner a perfect understanding of the Gospel, the gift of infallibility, and the privilege of a peculiar and permanent inspiration. St. Paul was subsequently added to the select number of the twelve recipients of these miraculous powers. After Pentecost there was no longer any possibility of divergence, and the doctrine proclaimed by all must be exactly similar. Such is the theory. But when we come to examine the books before us, we find, on the outside of things at least, no such perfect correspondence. The apostles were by no means passive agents of revelation. Each followed his own course: one was a writer, another a preacher; one speculative, another practical; and so on. Whatever general harmony may exist between them, it coexists with considerable apparent differences of form and expression. These might naturally be explained by three circumstances; 1, that the Gospel was never thoroughly apprehended by them; 2, that it was intended for development; and 3, that in the case of its first teachers it was, so to speak, built over previous conceptions and prejudices. "The more theology, religious sentiment and the gratitude of the world assign to Jesus Christ a place apart, and raise him above the level of humanity, the less ought we to expect inferior understandings to reach to his height. If he had been only a teacher, if his mission had been to proclaim a system, one might naturally conclude that he might have left disciples who in their turn might have been perfect organs of his secret thought. But such was not his object. In Christianity the idea was never separated from the life, and never in history has the life realized the idea. For this simple reason no Christian teaching in any age, in any nation, in any church, has ever been the adequate expression of the Christian thought, which, in its quality of absolute truth, belongs at the same time to the domain of the understanding, of sentiment and of action; and is, throughout, the reflection of the divinity and his perfections." Reuss goes on to point out that, though the first disciples had many advantages, these advantages were counterbalanced by the influence of their Jewish ideas and beliefs. The seed was sown in the earth according to Christ's own metaphor, but it was not to

attain its perfection in a day. Our Lord did not follow the usual course of first overthrowing what appeared to him erroneous, but established the principles of Gospel truth without attacking the formulas of the rabbis or the customs of the synagogue, so long as they did not go directly against the commandment of God, or pervert consciences. He built up his church without demanding previously the destruction of the temple. If one looks to the course of church history, one may say that Christianity has ever since been passing through a long metamorphosis, disengaging the evangelical idea more and more, slowly indeed but surely, from the foreign alloy which was at first mixed up with it in consequence of the feebleness of our human conceptions of it. Such is the explanation of the differences between the apostolical writers; an explanation which may, or may not, be accepted, but the acceptance or rejection of which does not materially affect Reuss' method.

From what has been already said it might be expected that Reuss would lay great stress on the Jewish character of the earliest Christianity. "The point of departure for theology in the case of the greater number, or the whole, of the first Christians, was Judaism, with the exception of a single proposition, rather historical than theological in its character, but which alone was destined to change the face of religion, of theology, and of the world itself." Judæo-Christianity was comprised in the single proposition, that Jesus was the Christ. The Old Testament was made the foundation of all arguments, and appealed to as an infallible authority. To the apostolical writers the principle of the double sense of Scripture was unknown; but one interpretation seemed to them possible, though to our eyes that interpretation appears often opposed to historical exegesis. In their view the Old Testament was verbally inspired; a fragment of a verse was sufficient for their purpose. So naturally the hopes of the Christian community were those of the synagogue. They felt that they were living in the last days. The great day of the Lord, the resurrection of the dead and the final judgment, were close at hand; the lake of fire would engulf the damned, and the just would be called to the marriage-feast. These ideas and hopes relating to the end of the world were embodied in the Apocalypse, the first canonical book of the New Testament. Written in the midst of persecution, it consoled the churches of Asia Minor with the prospect of coming deliverance; the Messiah would be revealed, and the time of his advent was at hand. Nothing can be simpler than the interpretation of the Apocalypse in this view. To interpret it according to the dreams of another age is to root it up from its

soil, and leave it suspended in mid air. There is a very note of Reuss' on the mystical number of 666, which is full with so many various explanations. He seems to make it out that it signified the name of Nero. It was the name of an emperor, an historical personage, a king, and one of seven. Of even kings the sixth was then reigning; and after the sixth, one who had been "wounded to death" was to return. The Apocalypse was written in the reign of Galba, the emperor. During the reign of Galba the Romans did not even expect in the death of Nero, who was "wounded to death," his expected return; and in fact many pretenders to the throne put themselves forward. The same expectation appears to have prevailed among the Christians also, and to have found its expression here. According to the Hebrew alphabet "Neron Cæsar" = 666, or if spelt "Nero" in Latin = 616, which accounts for an ancient various reading mentioned by Irenæus. After the Apocalypse the Epistle of St. James is the book next examined. This Reuss pronounces to be thoroughly Judæo-Christian. The name of our Lord is only mentioned twice; the law is regarded as "the law of liberty" and the rule of life for the Christian; faith is simply trust in God, and "the end of the Lord" is the final compensation given by God to Job. The object of the Epistle is purely practical, and perhaps written with a view to restrain the theological speculations and discussions which were beginning to spring up; wisdom and knowledge in St. James's view are best shewn in a "good conversation."

Before passing to St. Paul, Reuss has an interesting chapter on St. Stephen, pointing out that he seems to have been the first to recognize the incompatibility of the Mosaic institutions with the spiritual ideas of the Gospel. Whilst on previous occasions the apostles had been accused of preaching "Jesus and the resurrection," St. Stephen was now arraigned for speaking blasphemous words against Moses and the Law.

Reuss takes for his text, as containing the system of St. Paul, Rom. iii. 21—24, "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." With regard to the development of St. Paul's ideas, he says that, though doubtless it was some time before they were completely worked out, the preparatory labour had terminated before the date of any of the epi-

Between the first and last epistles there is only an interval of twelve years, which were spent in incessant travelling and the care of all the churches. No essential difference can be traced between his earlier and his later teachings; and even eschatological notions, which he is supposed to have borrowed at first from Judaism, are not succeeded by, but stand side by side with, the most spiritual ideas. From this results a certain amount of inconsistency in his expressions, like that which we all commit in speaking of astronomical facts according to the impressions derived from the senses. It is not our intention to go into all the details of the Pauline theology, but only to remark on a few points. At the close of his chapter on Predestination, Reuss has some observations which may have an interest for those who remember recent controversies at home. "The problem," he says, "is evidently beyond the powers of the human understanding, and for that reason revelation itself has not been able to give the solution of it; because revelation, which might well furnish man with ideas which he had not before, cannot change the laws of his nature, and give him faculties which nature has refused him. So it might give him just notions on the moral relations of God and the world, but it could not make him comprehend the very essence of God, nor the nature or the means of his action on the universe, because in order to do that it would have to raise man to the level of God." "Paul, alone of the authors of the New Testament, frankly enters upon the question, and if he does not succeed in solving it, far from making this a reproach to him, we would say that in that he is the single theologian among his contemporaries. That is the only true science, a *γνώσις καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι* (1 Cor. viii. 2), which clearly recognizes the bounds which are set to it (1 Cor. xiii. 9)." Passing by a carefully worked-out and useful chapter on Regeneration, we observe that on the cardinal doctrine of the Atonement, he rejects the theory of Anselm, and explains the Atonement by faith. "The substitution, and with it the redemption, are then accomplished, to say the truth, because, and in so far as, the old man is dead by mystical communion with the death of the Saviour, and not because God, as an ordinary creditor, finds his satisfaction in receiving the amount due to him without troubling himself to enquire whether it is the true debtor or not who pays him. Nothing is more estranged, nothing more radically different, from the idea of St. Paul than this theory worthy of Pharisaism. We repeat it, the pivot of the whole system of the apostle is faith, always faith."

The theology of St. Paul is founded on the trilogy,—faith, hope, and charity; which may be traced throughout his epistles,

though sometimes patience stands for hope (Tit. ii. 2), and the trilogy is otherwise varied. The common explanation of 1 Cor. xiii. 13 is, however, not altogether correct. Faith, according to St. Paul, is communion with Christ, and this is not to come to an end with the present life. The superiority of charity seems to consist in its being an attribute of God himself, conferring on man the seal of Divinity, whilst faith and hope are virtues appropriate only to man.

Probably most persons would consider that the title of "the divine," if appropriated to any New Testament author in particular, ought to be given to St. Paul. But tradition has given it to St. John. How do we explain this circumstance? The first epistle to which we should turn, as the main source of St. John's theology, seems very simple and unsystematic, however profound its ideas may be in reality. But in truth his main theological work is the gospel which bears his name. It is quite a mistake to look upon St. John's "gospel" in the same light as the other three "gospels;" a still greater to consider it a supplementary history. The facts are but the setting or the frame to the dogmatical system which it is its object to teach. The speakers in the dialogues, including our Lord himself, uniformly speak the same language, that of St. John. The parable of the other gospels is superseded by the allegory; the practical by the speculative; appeals to the conscience by appeals to feeling. Even the last few chapters, seemingly historical, are but the *dénouement* for which we have been already prepared by the prologue, a literal translation into fact of what has been already set forth in idea. Of all the books of the New Testament the Gospel of St. John is the most essentially dogmatic. It is an exposition of the Christian faith so far as the person of Jesus is the centre of it; not a biography, but a theological treatise; not a history, but a sermon. St. John's theology, however, is entirely mystical, and is founded on contemplation rather than on speculation; is the product not of the understanding, but of the heart. It is impossible to throw it into formulas, but it may be summed up into these words: "In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through him," (1 John iv. 9.) And further, even as regards his doctrine of the Word, his teaching may be considered incomplete as compared with what has been since accepted as orthodox. "It is not exegesis, it is philosophy which has consecrated the dogmatical formula of Nice, or the creed called that of St. Athanasius. We are far from calling in question its right to do so, but we reserve to ourselves the liberty to regard

as more or less deprived of importance whatever the gospel has not thought it advisable to include in its direct teaching." So again with regard to the doctrine of the Atonement, there is no mention of any vicarious satisfaction. The death of Jesus is the means of life for the world, either by purifying the world from sin, or reconciling the sinner with his judge. The life which is shut up in the Word, and by him alone revealed to the world, only becomes the property of man as far as he receives the Word and becomes united to him. All this belongs to the region of faith, and is as far as possible distant from the juridical view of scholasticism.

A striking instance of the slight shades of difference between the New Testament authors is remarked by Reuss as to the question of regeneration, as treated by St. Paul and St. John respectively. St. John does not use the word regeneration. He does not put the new birth in opposition to the past, but looks solely to the future. He speaks not of a new creation founded on the death of the old man, but of a new communication of power and spirit which will conduct towards life. A subsequent chapter enters at length into a general contrast between the two apostles, and another into that between St. John and the Apocalypse. In the fourth chapter of the sixth book, we have a discussion of the famous controversy of faith and works as represented by St. Paul and St. James respectively. The two apostles wrote independently of each other, and with different views. In St. James, faith is simply the conviction of the reality of some religious fact; in St. Paul, it is a life animated by God's Spirit. In St. James, works are the fulfilment of Christian duties; in St. Paul, acts done simply with regard to an external law. The two apostles are speaking of entirely different things, and there is no practical opposition between them. But theoretically there is a contrast. According to St. James, faith justifies because it is the source of good works; according to St. Paul, faith is the source of good works because it justifies. St. James's language is that of experience; St. Paul's that of theory, founded on his doctrine of regeneration.

In the latter part of the work is given an account of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement, the Acts of the Apostles, St. Matthew and St. Mark, and of Gnosticism. These notices being in themselves abstracts, it seems impossible to compress them still further with advantage; and our previous observations, if at all intelligible, may serve to give some idea of the general contents and method of the work. The conclusion of the whole is that Christianity was not introduced into the world as a ready-made system, destined to take

the place of all previous ones, but was a *principle of life* powerful enough to change even the nature of man. The Gospel preached by Jesus Christ, whatever developments it may have since received, will be for ever the supreme rule of Christian teaching. In the doctrine of Christ was contained at least the germ of all that has followed, and a depth deeper than has as yet been sounded by any of his disciples. The progress of truth has not been unvarying since that time. It is a mistake to suppose that Jewish ideas perished, and were superseded by the more spiritual doctrine of St. Paul. The reverse rather was the case for some time, and Judæo-Christianity left to the church the inheritance of its materialism, of its ascetic practices, of its hierarchy, and its ceremonial worship. But this reaction belongs to a later period than that traversed in the work before us; and the bare mention of such a view of the early history of Christianity will grate upon the ears of many, who look back with reverence to its great names, and are blinded by the halo which tradition has shed over it. On the whole, we arrive at the conviction expressed by the eloquent professor of ecclesiastical history at Oxford at the close of his introductory lectures, "A serious comparison of the actual contents of the Scriptures with the actual course of ecclesiastical events almost inevitably brings us to the conclusion that the existing materials, principles, and doctrines of the Christian religion are far greater than have ever yet been employed; that the Christian Church, if ever it be permitted or enabled to use them, has a long lease of new life and new hope before it, such as has never yet been enjoyed."

F. T. C.



Church of St. Thomas.—The *Observateur Catholique* calls attention to the interesting announcement respecting the Indian "Church of St. Thomas" in the *Indian Mail* of the 28th July. "The remarkable movement which has recently taken place in that portion of the ancient Syrian Church of Travancore, which *persecution had forced to recognize the Pope*, has succeeded, after three centuries, in vindicating that Church's independence. The Syro-Romanists have sent a deputation to Mesopotamia, where one of its number was consecrated Bishop, and who, on his return to Travancore, has notified his separation from Rome. Almost all the Syro-Romanists, without exception (estimated at 81,000 souls), have given in their adhesion to the new Bishop; and the Romanist Bishop remains with no more than from ten to twelve parishes." The Gallican journal observes: "Les Romanistes n'en chanteront pas moins leurs perpétuels triomphes: sans pouvoir toutefois en donner de preuves."—*Colonial Ch. Chronicle*.

THE DUBLIN CODEX RESCRIPTUS.

Supplement to Dr. Barrett's transcript of the CODEX DUBLINENSIS RESCRIPTUS (Z of St. Matthew), obtained by the chemical restoration of the MS.

By S. P. TREGELLES, LL.D.

THE following extract from my "Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament," pp. 166—169, will serve as the best introduction to the additional readings now given.

"Besides the MSS. which I have collated or re-examined, I have endeavoured, with some measure of success, to *restore* what remains of the Dublin palimpsest Z of St. Matthew's gospel.

"Dr. Barrett, the discoverer of the ancient writing of these important fragments, when he edited them in 1801, gave but a very partial description of the state of the different pages; and thus it was wholly a matter of uncertainty, when but a part of a page appeared on the engraved plate, whether the rest of the page still existed but was illegible, or whether it was no longer extant. There are also many places in which lines, words, or letters, in the pages in other respects tolerably perfect, are wanting in the published edition.

"As this MS. is one of the more important monuments of the text of St. Matthew's gospel (and as indeed all the *fragments* of such antiquity are of great value), it was very desirable to ascertain its present condition: to learn what parts are really there; *to use chemical means for restoring the text in any part in which the vellum still exists*, and which could not be read by Dr. Barrett; and thus to exclude from amongst the citations of authorities for readings the unsatisfactory doubt of 'Z.'

"Mr. Henry E. Brooke, B.A., of Trinity College, Dublin, had the kindness to examine the MS. for me; and, after having taken some pains, he was able to identify the larger number of the leaves containing the older uncial writing. This was not easy in the state in which the MS. then was. On inquiring, through Mr. Brooke, whether the authorities of Trinity College would take measures for the restoration of the older writing, it appeared best for me to go to Dublin myself and do it, if permitted by the Provost and the rest of the board of Trinity College. Accordingly, in October, 1853, I went thither, and my object was most kindly furthered by the Rev. James Henthorn Todd, D.D., librarian of the College, and one of the Senior Fellows. After giving him and the board ocular proof that the process of chemically restoring the obliterated writing was not injurious to the material, or to the later writing, I was allowed to proceed; and in the early part of November it was accomplished.

"The first thing was to identify the pages from which the fragments had been edited by Dr. Barrett. Mr. Brooke had already saved me much of this labour: and by a continuous examination in a strong light, I was able to discover all with the exception of one leaf. In thus examining the MS., I saw at once that where Dr. Barrett published but half a page, the other half was gone; for, in such cases, the scribe who re-used the ancient vellum for more modern works, has made out his page by sticking

on another piece to the ancient uncial fragment. The condition, too, of the MS. is much worse than it was in Dr. Barrett's days; for it has been *re-bound*,^a and that without any regard to the ancient writing. The binder simply seems to have known of the Greek book in the cursive letters, which are all black and plain to the eye. And so the pages have been unmercifully *strengthened* in parts, by pasting paper or vellum over the margins; leaving indeed the cursive writing untouched, but burying the uncial letters of so much greater value. Also in places there were fragments all rough at the edges of the leaves, and these have been cut away so as to make all smooth and neat; and thus many words and parts of words read by Dr. Barrett are now gone irrecoverably. And besides, the binder seems to have taken the traces of the ancient writing for *dirt marks*, and thus they have been in parts industriously obliterated; and in those places in which the writing instrument of the ancient copyist had deeply furrowed the vellum, a new surface of *size* (or something of the kind) had been superadded.

"The MS. being in such a state, I had to endeavour chymically to restore the words and letters in the parts still extant, which are blank in Dr. Barrett's publication. And in this I was very successful; so that in the existing portion of the MS. there is hardly a reading as to which any doubt remains. After doing what I could to the portions previously identified, I re-examined the whole of the volume in search of the one leaf not previously found. At length I noticed that in one place the texture of the vellum was like that of the fragments of St. Matthew; and though there was not a letter or line of the older writing to be seen in any position or light, I determined to try as an experiment whether the application would bring out any buried letters. In doing this, it was beyond all expectations of mine to see the ancient writing, first gradually and then definitely appear on the surface.

"The volume contains *no* ancient leaves of St. Matthew besides those edited by Dr. Barrett. The fragments of Isaiah and of Gregory Nazianzen differ from those of St. Matthew, and from one another as to vellum, handwriting, and age.

"I cannot speak of important discoveries through my work on this MS.; but still it was worth the trouble, if it only were that readings in it are rescued from mere uncertainty and conjecture, and questions are set at rest. For instance in Matt. xix. 24, Tischendorf cites this MS. for the reading *καμιλον*, and as it is of older date than the time when *ι* and *η* were confused by copyists, it might seem like authority for that word instead of the common *κάμηλον*. Now the presence of the Iota was simply a *conjecture* from the blank space in Dr. Barrett's page, and Lachmann cautiously cites "*καμ:λον Z*;" but I brought the whole word KAMHΛON distinctly to light (the H is at the end of one line, the three other letters at the beginning of the next).

^a "No person now connected with Trinity College, Dublin, is responsible for the manner in which this was done. It was the work of a departed generation, when the library must have been under care of a very different kind from that now exercised by Dr. Todd."

"As the authorities of Trinity College, Dublin, still possess the copper plates on which Dr. Barrett's (so-called) *fac-simile* is engraved, it is to be hoped that they will re-publish the text of this MS. *with the addition of all that can now be given*. This object would be furthered by Dr. Todd, the librarian, who has furnished me with a copy of Dr. Barrett's work, that I may insert in it all that could be read on the MS. as restored.

"In such a republication, the text in common Greek types may well be omitted; in fact its insertion was an injury to Dr. Barrett's book; for while what he had read in 1787 was expressed correctly by the engraver whom he employed, his accuracy of eye was so thoroughly gone in 1801 that he made great and strange mistakes in expressing the same text in common Greek letters.^b

"The work of the engraver gives a sort of *general idea* of the letters, etc.; but it cannot be commended for caligraphic exactitude; there is a stiffness and hardness in the engraving, very different from the formation of letters by the copyist from whose hand the MS. proceeded: this is very observable in the letters M and A."

To this account of the restoration of the readings of the MS. (which was written immediately after my return from Dublin in 1853), it may be convenient to subjoin the index to the pages of the codex in its present order, which I drew up when I was there: this will enable any one to identify, and if he pleases to re-examine, the ancient portion of this palimpsest.

^b "And yet it has been an accusation against Lachmann that he remarked on Dr. Barrett's unskilfulness. Mr. Scrivener says (*Supplement to Authorized Version*, introd., p. 24, *note*), "It might almost be said that Lachmann speaks well of no one. . . . But the most amusing case of all is Dr. Barrett's, who was guilty of editing the *fac-simile* of the Dublin palimpsest of St. Matthew (Z of Scholz). After duly thanking the engraver for his workman-like skill, Lachmann kindly adds, 'Johannem Barrettum, qui Dublini edidit anno 1801, non laudo: hominem huius artis, ultra quam credi potest, imperitum.'" This censure *much amused* Lachmann when I drew his attention to it; for he supposed that he had gently hinted Dr. Barrett's unskilfulness; little dreaming that this would be turned into a charge of speaking ill of others. He thought that when the engraver had expressed the text correctly on one page, and Dr. Barrett had given it in a different manner on the opposite (reading letters wrongly, and marking others as omitted which the engraved plate exhibits as there), that it was well to hint the fact, lest the wrong page should be taken as the authority for the text of this MS. Dr. Davidson quite agrees with Lachmann: "The editor gives on the opposite page to the *fac-simile* the words in the usual Greek type, with lines corresponding. *Here his accuracy cannot be commended. In fact he has made many blunders*" (*Biblical Criticism*, ii., 311). Lachmann did not know that the engraved plates were what Dr. Barrett read rightly in 1787, and the printed pages were what he read wrongly in 1801. His judgment, however, as to the incorrectness of the latter was quite a true one.

"No one would more fully see that the censure on Lachmann was undeserved than Mr. Scrivener himself, if *examining* Dr. Barrett's publication. . . .

"Lachmann thought that this was a good example of the mode in which reviewers in his own country had treated him—passing a judgment first, and learning the facts (if at all) afterwards. I am surprised that Mr. Scrivener should have charged Lachmann with hardly speaking well of any one, with the preface before him in which he so commends Bentley and Bengel."

Pages of the ancient writing according to the numbers in Dr. Barrett's tables.	Folios of the MS. in the present order.	Pages of the ancient writing according to the numbers in Dr. Barrett's tables.	Folios of the MS. in the present order.
i., ii.	51	xxxiii., xxxiv.	27
iii., iv.....	54	xxxv., xxxvi.	26
v., vi.	52	xxxvii., xxxviii.	65
vii., viii.	57	xxxix., xl.	23
ix., x.	20	xli., xlii.	25
xi., xii.	38	xliii., xliv.	28
xiii., xiv.	37	xlvi., xlvii.	18
xv., xvi.	21	xlvi., xlviii.	35
xvii., xviii.	69	xlix., l.	62
xix., xx.	66	li., lii.	59
xxi., xxii.	46	liii., liv.	40
xxiii., xxiv.	45	lv., lvi.	48
xxv., xxvi.	19	lvii., lviii.	43
xxvii., xxviii.	22	lix., lx.	17
xxix., xxx.	24	lxi., lxii.	75
xxxi., xxxii.	29	lxiii., lxiv.	76

In the following notes any letters brought to light (and one case a letter corrected) by the chemical restoration a marked : enough is also given to identify the passage.

Table. Ch. Ve.	
II. I. 21, <u>TOYIN</u>	
„ „ <u>AMARTION</u>	
„ 22, <u>YPOKY</u>	
„ „ <u>TOYΛEΓONTOS</u>	
III. I. 24, <u>ΠΡΟΣΕΤΑΞΕΝ</u>	
IV. II. 5, <u>ΒΗΘ ΛΕΕΜ</u>	
„ 6, <u>ΙΟΥΔΑ</u>	
„ „ <u>ΕΞΕΛΕΥΣΕΤΑΙ</u>	
„ „ <u>ΗΓΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ</u>	
VI. II. 17-20, a letter in whole or in part rendered visible at the beginning of each line, thus:—	
<u>ΟΤΕ ΔΙΑ ΦΗΤΟΥ NHEN</u>	
<u>ΚΛΑΥΘΜΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΣ ΤΑ</u>	
<u> ΘΕΛΗΣΕΝ ΟΤΙ ΕΛΕΥΤΗ-</u>	
<u>ΣΑΝΤΟΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΚΥ</u>	
<u>ΤΩ ΛΕΓΩΝ ΛΑΒΕ</u>	
VI. II. 18, <u>ΒΡΥΓΜΟΣ</u> entirely legible.	
„ „ <u>ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΘΗΝΑΙ</u>	

Table. Ch. Ve.	
VII. IV. 4, <u>ΑΡΤΟ</u>	
„ 6, <u>ΕΙΠΕΝ</u>	
VIII. IV. 10, <u> NΣΟΥ</u>	
XI. VI. 5, 6, a letter now legible at the ends of several of the mutilated lines.	
5, <u>ΠΛΑ ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧ ΑΠΕΧ </u>	
<u>ΑΥΤΩ </u>	
6, <u>ΤΑΜΙΕΙΟ ΒΛΕΠΩΝ</u>	
7, <u>ΠΟΛΥΛΟΓΙΑ</u>	
XII. VI. 9, <u>ΟΥΡΑ </u>	
„ 10, <u>ΒΑΣΙ </u>	
„ „ <u>ΘΕΛΗΜΑ</u>	
„ 13, <u>ΕΙΣΕ</u>	
„ „ <u> ΝΕΓΚΗΣ</u>	
„ „ <u> ΣΜΟΝΑΛΛΑ</u>	
„ 14, <u>ΑΥΤΩΝ</u>	
XIII. VII. 20, <u>ΕΠΙΓΝΩ </u>	
„ „ <u> ΣΕΣΘΕ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ</u>	
„ 21, <u>ΚΕ·Κ </u>	

The bad condition of the vellum hindered more of the illegible parts of this leaf from being restored.

Table.	Ch.	Ve.
XIV.	VII.	23, ΔΕΠΟΤΕ
„	„	ΕΡΓΑΖΟΜΕΝΟΙ
„	24,	ΟΥΣ
„	„	ΚΑΙ
„	„	ΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ
„	„	ΟΣΤΙΣ
„	25,	ΗΒΡΟΧΗ
„	„	ΑΝΕΜΟΙΚΑΙ- ΠΡΟΣΕΠΕΣΑΝ
XV.	VII.	27, ΕΠΙΝΕΥΣ
After ΕΚΕΙΝΗΚΑΙ apparently Ε		
Query Ε[ΓΕΝΕΤΟ]		
XV.	VII.	27, ΠΤΩΣΙΣΑΥ
„	VIII.	1, ΚΑΤΑΒΑΝΤΟΣ
XVI.	„	5, ΟΣΔΕΑΥΤΟΥΕΙΣ
„	„	ΟΥΜΠΡΟΣΗΛ
XVII.	X.	41, ΠΡΟΦΗΤ
„	„	ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ
„	„	ΔΙΚΑΙΟ
„	42,	ΕΝΑΤΩ
XVIII.	XI.	2, ΑΥΤΟΥ

Ver. 4—7, letters legible at the beginning of several lines:—

ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΑΠΑΓΓΕΙΛΑΤΕ
ΤΥΦΛΟΙ ΛΕΠΡΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΚΡΟΙ
XVIII. XI. 5, ΕΥΑΝΓΕΛΙ[ZO
ut vid.] |ΤΑΙ

„	6,	ΟΣΕΑΝ
„	„	ΕΝΕΜΟΙ
„	7,	ΑΥΤΩΝΔΕΠΟ- ΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΩ
„	„	ΗΡΞΑΤΟ
„	„	ΧΛΟΙΣ

Table.	Ch.	Ve.
XVIII.	XI.	7, ΤΗΝΕΡΗ
„	„	ΚΑΛΑΜΟΝ
XIX.	XI.	9, ΕΞΗ
„	11,	ΟΔΕΜΙΚΡΟΤΕΡΟΣ
XX.	XI.	13, ΕΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΣΑΝ
„	14,	ΕΣΤΙΝ
„	„	ΕΡΧΕΣΘΑΙ
„	17,	ΗΥΛΗΣΑΜΕΝ
„	18,	ΠΙΝΩ
XXII.	XII.	46, [ΛΑΛΗ]ΣΑΙ
„	47,	ΤΙΣ ΑΥΤΩ
„	48,	ΓΟΝΤΙ
„	„	ΜΗΤΗΡ
„	„	ΙΝΟΙ
„	49,	ΕΚΤΕΙΝΑΣ
„	„	ΜΑΘΗΤΑΣ
„	50,	ΜΟΥΤΟΥΕΝ
XXIII.	XIII.	2, ΚΑΙΣΥΝ
„	3,	ΛΑΙΣΛΕΓΩΝ
„	5,	ΟΠΟΥΟΥΚΕ
XXIV.	XIII.	6, ΔΙΑΤ°
XXIX.	XV.	13, ΑΠΟΚΡΙΘΕΙΣ
„	„	ΦΥΤΕΙΑΗ
„	„	ΠΗΡΜ
XXX.	XV.	13, part of ΕΞΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ can be traced at the top of the page.
XXXII.	XVII.	17, ΩΓΕΝΕΑ
„	„	ΣΤΡΕΜΜΕΝΗ
„	„	ΦΕΡΕΤΑΙ
XXXIII.	XVII.	27, ΔΕΜΗΣΚ
XXXVII.	XIX.	24, ΚΑΜΗ
„	„	ΛΟΝ
XXXVIII.	XIX.	28, ΔΟΞΗΣ
XLI.	XX.	19, ΜΑΣΤΙ
„	„	ΕΓΕΡΘΗΣ

Table.	Ch.	Ve.
XLII.	XX.	23, ΛΛ'ΟΙΣ
„	25,	ΥΤΟΥΣ
XLIII.	XX.	29, ΗΚΟΛΟΥΘΗΣΕΝ
XLVI.	XXI.	6, ΠΟΙΗΣΑΝ
„	„	ΟΣΕΤΑΞΕΝ
„	7,	ΥΤΩΝ
„	8,	ΟΙΠΤΟΝ
„	„	ΤΩΝ
XLVII.	XXI.	25, ΟΙΔΕΔΙΑΛΟ- ΓΙΖΟΝΤΟ
„	„	ΕΡΕΙ <i>ut vid.</i>
XLVIII.	XXI.	27, ΤΩΙΥ
„	28,	ΙΔΕΥΜΙΝ
„	„	ΕΙΧΕΝ
„	„	ΕΛΘΩΝ
XLIX.	XXI.	38, ΣΧΩΜΕ
„	39,	ΑΜΠΕΛ
„	41,	ΓΕΩΡΓΟΥ

Table.	Ch.	Ve.
L.	XXI.	45, ΟΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ
LI.	XXII.	16, ΟΔΟ
„	17,	ΔΟΥΝ
„	18,	ΠΟΝ
LII.	XXII.	22, ΣΑΝΚΑΙ
LVI.	XXIII.	19, ΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ
„	20,	ΥΝΟΜΟΣΑΣ
„	21,	ΜΝΥΕΙ
„	„	ΟΙΚΗΣΑΝΤΙ
LVII.	XXIV.	20, ΔΕΣΑΒΒΑΤΩ (apparently, not EN)
LVIII.	XXIV.	24, ΡΙΣΤΟΙ
LIX.	XXV.	6, ΕΓΟΝΕΝ
„	„	ΕΞΕΡΧΕΣΘΕΕΙΣ——
„	„	ΠΑΝ——
„	7,	ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΙ
„	„	ΣΜΗΣΑΝΤΑΣΛΑΜΠΑ
LXIV.	XXVI.	66, ΣΤΙΝ
„	67,	ΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ

The importance of these additions is not that they in general bring to light new readings of value, but it lies in this, that *doubt* is often removed as to what the reading of the MS. really is; for this purpose a letter or a part of a letter brought to light is sometimes valuable and decisive; and thus as these corrections were in my possession, it was undesirable that they should remain in obscurity. In some parts (such as Tables IX. and X.) the bad state of the leaves prevented more from being accomplished; and often the very part from which Dr. Barrett read but little, is now buried in the binding.

S. T. P.

Plymouth, 28th Oct., 1862.

EXEGESIS OF DIFFICULT TEXTS.

MATTHEW xv. 27.

THE logical connexion between *Ναὶ*, *κύριε*, and *καὶ γὰρ τὰ πυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων, κ.τ.λ.*, has always been a stumbling-block to commentators. Some have made *καὶ γὰρ* = *ἀλλὰ γὰρ*, and translated "yet," as the Authorized Version. Others have made *ναὶ* a humble concession to our Lord, and enveloped the logical difficulty of *γὰρ* in a cloud of words. But a passage from the *Cyclops* of Euripides (lines 554 and 555) appears likely to set the matter at rest in a very simple manner. It runs :

Cyclops. κλάυσει φιλῶν τὸν οἶνον οὐ φιλοῦντά σε.

Silenus. ναὶ μὰ Δι', ἐπεὶ μού φησ' ἐρᾶν ὄντος καλοῦ.

"You shall catch it for liking the wine, when it doesn't like you."

Yes, by Zeus, (it does like me though), since it says it's in love with me because I am handsome."

Apply this meaning of *ναὶ*, somewhat approaching to the German *doch* and our *yes* as formerly opposed to *yea*, and the sense comes out very simply. "She came and prostrated herself before him saying, Lord, help me. But he answered and said, It is not good to take the children's bread, and throw it to the dogs. And she said, Yes, Lord, [it is though], for even the dogs eat from the crumbs that fall from the children's table." Our Lord stated the matter broadly and generally in order to try her faith, and she in reply shewed that in a certain qualified and secondary sense his general principle did not hold; for the crumbs that fell from the children's table were ordinarily the portion of the dogs. But if any one prefers to supply *βοήθει μοι* to *ναὶ*, and understand it in the sense, "Yes, Lord, do help me though, for even the dogs," etc., we are not inclined to find much fault with him.

LUKE II. 2.

Commentators do not appear to have noticed the confirmation given by the words of this verse, when literally translated, to the discovery of A. W. Zumpt, that Publius Sulpicius Quirinus was *twice* governor of Syria. The translation should run: "This was the first census that took place while Quirinus was governor of Syria." The second took place after the banishment of Archelaus.* It is not sense to say with Alford, "This enrolment first took place when Cyrenius was governor of Syria."

* Joseph., *Ant.*, xvii., 13, 5.

In speaking of one particular enrolment, how can the expression "first took place" be applicable to it? The same enrolment cannot take place twice. Besides, that would have required *πρῶτον* instead of *πρώτη*. The word *πρώτη* implies that Quirinus afterwards conducted a second census, and we find that he did subsequently hold one, as recorded by Josephus above referred to.

ROMANS XI. 8.

It is perfectly clear that *πνεῦμα κατανύξεως* here means a spirit of apathy, torpidity, numbness, insensibility, or something of the kind, while it is equally clear that *κατανύσσω* means to prick, and that sharply. Compare Acts ii. 37: *κατενύγησαν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, "they were pricked in heart." No comparison of the German word *betroffen*, or our own panic-struck, thunder-stricken, appears to us to give the slightest assistance in connecting *κατάνυξις* with *κατανύσσω*, with which it is certainly connected, and not with *κατανυστάζω*. But look at the forefinger of the left hand of a needlewoman! It is covered with dead skin, and perfectly insensible on the surface from the constant pricking of the needle. Here we have the connexion between "pricking" and "insensibility," which we require. Similarly, a person who habitually neglects the prickings of conscience becomes dead and insensible to them, just like the needlewoman's finger. And the metaphor would come naturally to a tent-maker, which was the ordinary trade of St. Paul.

PHILIPPIANS I. 10, 11, AND COLOSSIANS I. 9.

In both these passages, and in no others, we have the passive of *πληρόω* with an accusative. It is a very singular thing that Dean Alford, Bishop Ellicott, and De Wette persist in translating them both as if *πληρόω* were connected with a genitive instead of an accusative. Dean Alford talks of the accusative of "reference or secondary government," an accusative which we have no hesitation in saying does not exist in the Greek language in any collocation similar to these; and if we look at the references which the Dean brings forward to prove his position, we find on Phil. i. 11, that he only refers us to Col. i. 9, and on Col. i. 9 only to Phil. i. 11. We consider that he has been simply misled by De Wette, who is thoroughly confused on the subject, and that merely from the bad habit of treating such accusatives as accusatives of respect, which they certainly are not. De Wette seems to have considered that the alternatives he had to choose between were, (1) "being completed *in respect of* the fruit of righteousness," and (2) "being filled with the fruit of righteousness;" the latter of which we maintain is not Greek

grammar, and the former of which we willingly concede is scarcely sense, and smacks rather of the schoolboy than the ripe scholar. But these accusatives with passive verbs are generally translated very differently by scholars at the present day, and are considered to originate from an accusative directly objectively governed by the active verb. *Πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* would now be translated "having had the fruit of righteousness, which (fruit) is through Jesus Christ completed;" and *αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῇτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ* would similarly be rendered, "asking that ye may have your knowledge of his will perfected or completed."

There is also a singular construction of the passive of *πληρώω* in Eph. iii. 19; *ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which we should certainly translate, "that ye may be completed unto all the completeness of God," i.e., "that ye may be perfected till ye attain to all the perfection of God."

PHILIPPIANS I. 25.

Singular difficulties present themselves in this passage, which at first sight looks so simple and easy, when we come to analyze it. Commentators differ as to whether *τοῦτο* should be taken with *πεποιθὼς* or with *οἶδα*. If it should be taken with *πεποιθὼς*, it is clearly the cognate object of *πεποιθὼς*, and the phrase is equivalent to *πεποιθὼς ταύτην τὴν πεποίθησιν*, "entertaining this confidence." But then the question arises, Entertaining *what* confidence? This question we cannot easily answer. If we go back to the "earnest expectation and hope" of verse 20, we find a confidence that "in nothing I shall be ashamed," which is inapplicable to the alternatives of being with Christ, or remaining with his converts for their future good.

Again, if *τοῦτο* be taken with *οἶδα* as the antecedent of the following *ὅτι* and its clause, we should have expected the slightly adversative *δὲ* instead of *καὶ*, as introducing an expression of certainty after a series of doubts.

We are therefore by logical exigency thrown upon the adverbial meaning of *τοῦτο*, which *τὸ αὐτὸ* is acknowledged by Dean Ellicott to have, in Phil. ii. 18, *τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ὑμεῖς χαίρετε*, "and for the same reason do ye also rejoice." Other instances are Gal. ii. 10; 2 Pet. i. 5; and very probably Philip. i. 6, *πεποιθὼς αὐτὸ τοῦτο*, which is so taken by Coneybeare and Howson, although their "accordingly" is far too weak. Neither is the same rendering at all inapt in Philip. i. 9, *καὶ τοῦτο προσεύχομαι ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.*, "And therefore I pray that," etc.

Here the translation of *τοῦτο* by "therefore," arises most simply and logically out of the preceding verse. "To abide in

the flesh is more needful for you, and *therefore* feeling confident, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all.

All these adverbial uses of the accusative case appeared to have originated in the construction of the cognate accusative, under which Dr. Donaldson very properly classes them, but to have become, as he also says, in course of time simply adverbial. Similar instances in Plato are almost too abundant to be worth quoting, but there is so exact a parallel to τὸ αὐτὸ χαίρετε in Cicero, *Ad. Div.*, vii. 1. Cicero says, *utrumque lætor*, "I am delighted on both accounts," *i.e.*, with stricter reference to the origin of the expression "I feel both delights." But the former is clearly the proper meaning in the connexion, although the latter shews how it came to have that meaning.

For the quasi-adverbial use of πεποιθὼς compare the LXX. of Jer. xxiii. 6; Ἰσραὴλ κατασκηνώσει πεποιθὼς, "Israel shall dwell confidently."

PHILIPPIANS II. 6.

We consider it conclusively proved that the rendering of the Authorized Version is wrong, and that Bishop Ellicott and others have clearly shewn that the logic of the passage admits only of a rendering of ἀρπαγμὸν, which treats it as nearly equivalent to ἄρπαγμα. What Dean Alford means by translating ἀρπαγμὸν by "self-enrichment," we are utterly at a loss to conceive, and can only account for the confusion of this usually excellent commentator by supposing that the multitude of commentators determined to see difficulties in a passage in which there really are none has somewhat distorted his vision. Ἀσπασμὸς is a word of the same form as ἀρπαγμὸς, and though it no doubt properly means the act of saluting, yet it is practically used in exactly the same manner as ἄσπασμα. So too δόσις has constantly the meaning of δόμα, as in *Æsch.*, *Eumen.*, 7, δίδωσι δ' ἡ γενέθλιον δόσιν Φοίβῳ. In our own language we have an excellent illustration of a similar transition of signification. The word "catch," used as a substantive, signifies, primarily, "the act of catching;" then, secondarily, "a thing worth catching." If we might apply this word here without irreverence, it would give an excellent translation of the passage, "Who thought it not a catch to be equal with God." The transition is very easy from the *actus rapiendi* to the *res rapienda*, from the "act of seizing" to the "object worth seizing," and still more so when the *res rapienda* is itself a *state*, not a thing. For a good deal may be said on τὸ εἶναι ἸΣΑ Θεοῦ. Dean Alford fairly enough says, that the use of the plural ἴσα indicates a *state*, but we do not think he presses this part of the passage so much as he might

have done. In Thucydides, iii., 15, we have ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἴσα καὶ ἱκεταὶ (=ἴσα ἱκεταῖς) ἐσμέν. The meaning of this is clearly, "in the temple we are *practically* equal to, *practically* in the position of suppliants." Τὸ εἶναι ἸΣΟΝ Θεῷ might have implied a theoretical equality, which has always subsisted. Our Lord, though existing from the beginning in the essential form of God, thought it no object, thought it not worth while to be on a practical equality with God in heaven, but divested himself of his glory, and assumed our nature for our salvation. This explanation is both fully orthodox and free from either logical or grammatical difficulty.

It is a most remarkable thing that in the Bible of the Bohemian brethren we find just the same difficulty as in the original Greek of this passage. The words are, "Kteryz gsa w zpusobu Bozjm nepolozil sobe toho za *laupez*, rowny byti Bohu." *Laupez* means, primarily, the act of robbing; secondarily, the booty thus obtained. Jungmann, in his great Bohemian Lexicon, inserts this passage under the *second* sense of *laupez*, which he was apparently led to do by a passage from another religious book, which paraphrases the words so as not to admit of any doubt.

PHILIPPIANS III. 14.

We cannot but think that the translation of the Authorized Version, which is preserved by Bishop Ellicott, is singularly awkward. "I press on toward the mark for the prize," etc. Comparing Acts viii. 26, πορεύου κατὰ μεσημβρίαν, it is manifest at once that "go southward" is a far preferable translation in the latter passage to the clumsy "toward the south" of the Authorized Version. Applying the same method to the passage under consideration, we obtain a much more vivid and simple rendering; "I press on GOALWARD for the prize," etc.

Reading the *Œdipus Coloneus* of Sophocles at the time when we were considering these passages, we discovered a satisfactory explanation of a passage which is not satisfactorily explained in the common books. In lines 1067 and 1068 the chorus says: πᾶς γὰρ ἀστράπτει χαλινὸς, πᾶσα δ' ὀρμάται κατὰ ἀμπυκτήρια ἄμβασις. Accepting as correct the view that πᾶσα ἄμβασις = πάντες ἀναβάται, i.e. ἱππόται, what are we to do with κατὰ ἀμπυκτήρια? It is ridiculous to say with J. H. Parker's little Oxford edition, "κατὰ, either *as regards the bridles*; i. e., they shew their haste in respect to them; or, *quantum frena valent*, nearly =adv." Which alternative of the two offered by the Oxford editor is the most absurd, it is hard to say. Ἀμπυκτήρια are not the *bridles*, but the *frontlets* of the bridles, and κατὰ ἀμπυκτήρια would naturally signify *in the direction of the frontlets*,

i. e., *forwards*. “For every bit is flashing, and every mounted man is hasting **FORWARDS**.” How people could shew their haste “in respect to” bridles is hard to say, unless they made great haste in cleaning or putting them on; and how they could do so “*quantum frena valent*,” is equally difficult to understand, bridles being generally used to check or direct horses, and whips or spurs to urge them on. But if we treat *κατ’ἀμπυκτήρια*, as everybody agrees to treat *κατὰ σκοπὸν* and *κατὰ μεσημβρίαν*, all difficulty vanishes at once.

PHILIPPIANS III. 16.

Bishop Ellicott, rightly rejecting the additional words given by that worst of texts, the *textus receptus*, viz., *κάνονι τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*, translates, “Nevertheless whereto we have attained—in the same direction walk ye onward.” This appears to be scarcely either English or sense. When a person has attained to a given point, it not being mentioned in what direction he has gone to it, it is no very definite precept to give, to tell him to go on in the same direction. And the adverb in *ἡ*, as *ταύτῃ*, is the usual mode of expressing direction, not anything so indefinite as *τῷ αὐτῷ*. Indeed if *εἰς ὃ* be relative to *τῷ αὐτῷ*, the injunction is to walk *by* the same *point* to which we have attained. It seems to us that the words added by the *textus receptus* are a good gloss, though not a part of the sacred text. From Gal. vi. 16, *ὅσοι τῷ κάνονι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν*, it would seem that *κάνονι* should be mentally supplied to *τῷ αὐτῷ*, or that, if *τῷ αὐτῷ* be considered as neuter, it should be considered as equivalent to *τῷ αὐτῷ κάνονι*, but is in nowise the antecedent of *εἰς ὃ*. Then *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*, as a gloss, would be a correct explanation of *τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν*. *Εἰς ὃ* should be translated “so far as,” and the person of *ἐφθάσαμεν* is accounted for by St. Paul’s habit of identifying himself with his converts, and is equivalent to *ὑμῶν τις ἐφθασεν*. Translate: “Be that as it may, so far as we have attained, walk by the same rule;” i. e., let not difference of religious attainment cause you to break the unity of the body of Christ; let each according to his attainments regulate his life upon the same principles, and let all be unanimous in their several spheres.

For *εἰς ὃ* = “so far as,” compare Thucyd., iii., 66, 2, *μάλιστα δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, εἰς ὃ ἐμέμνηντο, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐξεπλάγησαν*. “The Lacedæmonians, *so far as* they remembered, were never so terrified as on this occasion.”

PHILIPPIANS III. 20.

Accepting Bishop Ellicott’s view, that *πολίτευμα* is the city

of which we are *πολιται*, we cannot forbear remarking, that to us the corresponding idea to that conveyed to Greeks by the word *πολίτευμα* would be the idea of *home*, whence while in the flesh we are strangers and pilgrims. "For our HOME is in heaven."

COLOSSIANS II. 20—23.

We are not about to engage in a lengthened disquisition upon this passage, an analysis of the literature of which would occupy many pages. We would just remark, that the rendering of *πρὸς*, proposed by Archbishop Sumner, and adopted by Conybeare, "against," appears to us completely contrary to the analogy of the Greek language. *Πρὸς*, of itself, never means *contra*, but simply *ad*, which may be turned into *adversus* = *contra* by the idea contained in the word it follows, but not otherwise. Thus in *πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν*, which the Archbishop and Conybeare quote, the idea of hostility is implied in *λακτίζειν*, not in *πρὸς*. But in this passage there is no word whatever to strengthen or in anywise alter the simple notion of "tendency to," which properly belongs to *πρὸς* with an accusative.

In the second place, we must notice that *δογματίζεσθε*, with which Dean Alford appears to connect *πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς*, is too far off for the mind to carry on the construction from the one to the other. It is impossible to read the passage aloud so as to convey the notion that the two phrases are connected. We conclude, therefore, that the latter part of the passage has not yet been satisfactorily interpreted.

This being assumed to be the case, it is probable that there is a harsh or unusual use of one or more words in the passage, which, if discovered, may furnish us with a key to the whole. Let us direct especial attention to the word *τιμῇ*. It is very awkward to refer *οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι*, as almost everybody does, back to *σώματος*, which in that case would rather have followed than preceded those words. We find *τιμῇ* used several times in the sense of *price* or *value*, as Matt. xxvii. 6, *τιμὴ αἵματος ἐστίν*, "it is the *price* of blood." So too Acts iv. 34; v. 2, 3; vii. 16; xix. 19; 1 Cor. vi. 20, which latter passage is the only instance of this use in St. Paul's extant writings. But in 1 Peter ii. 7, we find a peculiar use of *τιμῇ*. "There is a passage in the Scripture: 'Behold, I place in Sion a corner-stone, chosen, *precious*, and he who believes in it shall not be put to shame. For you then who believe is the *preciousness*, but if people disobey,' etc. If preferred, the words *valuable* and *value* may be substituted for *precious* and *preciousness*. Taking this sense of *τιμῇ*, namely, *value* or *preciousness*, we get a pretty satisfactory sense out of

the latter part of the passage from the Epistle to the Colossians under consideration. St. Paul shews (1) in what the repute of wisdom of the systems of the false teachers against whom he is writing consisted, *i. e.*, in voluntary worship and humble-mindedness and unsparingness of the body; (2) in what it did *not* consist, *i. e.*, not in any *preciousness* or real value; and (3) what the tendency of those systems was, *i. e.*, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς, to the repletion of the flesh, such repletion as renders men spiritually proud and ‘full of bread.’ There is a clear distinction between the mere body (σῶμα) and the flesh (σὰρξ), or lower carnal nature, which lusts against the Spirit (πνεῦμα), Gal. v. 17. The whole passage will then run as follows, in which it will be seen that we do not in other respects vary materially from Dean Alford:—‘If ye have died with Christ from the rudiments of the sphere, *i. e.*, the rudimentary Mosaic dispensation, why, as though living in a sphere, or rudimentary dispensation, do ye have rules prescribed to you? Handle not, neither taste nor even touch [things] which come to destruction when used up [and done with], conformably to the commandments and doctrinal systems of [mere] men; rules which have a repute of wisdom, consisting in voluntary worship and humble-mindedness and unsparingness of the body, not in any preciousness [or real value of their own], [and] tending to repletion of the flesh or lower carnal nature.’”

This view we published in *Specimens of Annotations on the New Testament* in 1852, and we rejoice to find that Bishop Ellicott in 1857 put forward exactly the same, which he bases on the Syriac version, in his commentary on the passage. He does not, however, quote any passage in which the sense of *preciousness* or *value* belongs to τιμὴ in the New Testament, so that these remarks are at all events supplementary to Bishop Ellicott’s note, and a confirmation of the view indicated by the Syriac version, from simple reasoning on the sense and logic of the passage.

HEBREWS I. 7.

The natural translation of this, considered as classical Greek, would undoubtedly be, “And with regard to the angels he saith: Who maketh his angels winds and his ministers a flame of fire.” But this is simply senseless as regards the context. Again, it is evidently incorrect to translate: “Who maketh *the* winds his angels,” πνεύματα being not *the* winds, but *some* winds. We believe the correct translation to be: “Who maketh winds his messengers (or angels) and a flame of fire his ministers,” the article being used, not as in good Greek to distinguish subject

from predicate, but simply to help out the personal pronoun *αὐτοῦ*. And we think we can justify this by a comparison of other passages from the Psalms in the Hebrew original and LXX. Version. Let it be remembered too, that a large number of Hebraisms have entered into our own language from our versions of the Old Testament; much more must the Hellenistic Greek have been affected by the Hebrew.

The Hebrew of this quotation (Psalm civ. 4) runs as follows :

הַיְיָ יִצְחָק לִפְנֵי
: עַל כֵּן שֶׁ יִתְפַּשֵּׁר

And the LXX. according to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Alexandrian MS.

Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα
Καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα.

The Vatican MS. has *πῦρ φλέγον* instead of *πυρὸς φλόγα*, but this does not in anywise affect the argument, as it is clear that the latter part of the sentence must stand or fall by the fate of *ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα*.

Now, what we have to prove is, that, according to the analogy of the Hebrew language, which is closely followed by the LXX., *πνεύματα* can be the direct object of *ὁ ποιῶν* and *τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ*, a tertiary predicate of *πνεύματα*.

The first passage we would quote is Ps. cv. 32, *תָּבַר עֲשֵׂהָ מַיָּם*, which the LXX. translate, *ἔθετο τὰς βροχὰς αὐτῶν χάλαζαν*.

It is equally clear that the analogy of the Greek language would require the translation: "He made their rains hail," and that the Hebrew requires, "He gave hail [as] their rains." But the article before *βροχὰς* is merely used to help out the personal pronoun *αὐτῶν*.

Again, in Psalm civ. 3, we have the same construction with a different order of the words *יְהוָה עָרָב עָפָר*, and the LXX., *ὁ τιθεὶς νέφη τὴν ἐπίβασιν αὐτοῦ*. Here the Authorized Version goes astray by inserting the article "the" before clouds. The translation should run: "Who maketh clouds (not *the* clouds, but *some* clouds) his chariot."

We think these passages are amply sufficient to shew that the LXX. understood their business *upon their own principles*, and that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has brought forward a valid and consistent argument. If God makes winds and fire his messengers or angels, the angels, as a class, surely occupy a very subordinate position in the universe.

1 Peter III. 21.

In this much controverted passage the difficulty has arisen

from the fact that ἐπερωτήμα is a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον in any sense, that will produce a coherent and logical meaning. In the sense of *question* the word is sufficiently recognized; in that of *answer* it is not merely unknown, but impossible. Two principal methods of solving the difficulty have been adopted by commentators; the one party seeking for a *technical* use of the word, the other endeavouring to obtain a satisfactory sense by a development of the recognized meaning of *question*, and by comparison with the Septuagint version.

Winer, followed by Dean Alford, deduces ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεὸν from the LXX. usage, (2 Sam. xi. 7): ἐπηρώτησε Δαβὶδ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ λαοῦ = "David asked after the peace (= welfare) of the people," and translates it "the enquiry of a good conscience after God," by which he appears to understand, "an honest turning to and search after God." But place this in connexion with the ceremony of baptism; place it in juxtaposition to the "putting away" of bodily or fleshly, and external impurity, and what logical coherence can we by any possibility discover? For no one has ever pretended that the inward or spiritual grace in baptism is a search or enquiry after God. It is not those who are *seeking*, but those who have *found* God in Christ, who come to the sacrament of baptism. In a logical point of view the passage thus translated becomes simple nonsense, which in fact Dean Alford pretty nearly acknowledges, when he avows that he only adapts the above rendering as a choice of evils, and admits that it is unsatisfactory.

In discussing the word itself Winer says, that ἐπερωτᾶν may mean *stipulari*, but *promittere* must be ἐπερωτᾶσθαι, as the glossaries inform us, as well as the fact that *promissum* is ἐπερωτηθὲν with the Greek jurists. He is however sorely dismayed—for what reason we cannot conceive—at the notion of deriving ἐπερώτημα from ἐπερωτᾶσθαι, and taking it as = *promissio*. This sense of a promise or contract Dean Alford admits ἐπερώτημα to possess in Byzantine Greek, though we imagine he would be sorely put to it to find an authority for his statement, unless it be the following, which De Wette partially quotes. Æcumenius, in his commentary on the passage, has the following words: "Ὁ ἀντίτυπον καὶ ἡμᾶς σώζει νῦν βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ῥύπου ὄν ἀπόθεσις, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως τῆς εἰς Θεὸν [ἐπερώτημα]. Ἐπερώτημα δὲ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἈΡΡΑΒΩΝ, ἘΝΕΧΤΡΟΝ, ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΙΣ; where it is pretty clear that the word ἐπερώτημα in brackets must be supplied to make the sentence complete, the omission having manifestly arisen from the circumstance of the second explanatory sentence beginning with the word which concluded the one preceding. An ἐπερώτημα then, according to Æcume-

nus, is an *earnest*, a *pledge*, or a *proof*. But this is the only authority for this use of the word of which we are aware, the cognate form 'ΕΠΕΡΩΤΗΣΙΣ being the regular recognized law term in the sense of a *contract*.

Yet if we were to consider the words ἐπερώτησις and ἐπερώτημα, in and for themselves, by the ordinary rules of scholarship, we should undoubtedly say that ἐπερώτησις would *à priori* in all probability mean the act of making a contract, while ἐπερώτημα would probably signify the concrete result of the other, *i.e.*, the contract made by *stipulatio*, or question and answer. The termination in *σις* corresponds regularly to the Latin termination *io*, while that in *μα* corresponds to, and is really identical with, the termination *mentum*. But if we turn to our Latin lexicons, we find that the termination in *mentum* is not in use in the law terms, to which we must have recourse in the present instance, whereas the termination *io* has to do double duty, both for its own signification of the action and also for that of the concrete result. We find *stipulatio* regularly used in the sense of a contract, and translated by Forcellini into Greek by ἐπερώτησις.

But we find no word *stipulamentum*, which would naturally express the result of *stipulatio*. Nay, in Seneca (*De Beneficiis* iii., 15), we find INTERROGATIO used in the sense of *sponsio*. Such is the view of Forcellini, though Wilhelm Freund reduces the passage of Seneca to simple nonsense by explaining *interrogatio* as a figure of rhetoric; thus proving in all probability that he never consulted the context. The passage itself is this: "Adhibentur ab utrâque parte testes; ille per tabulas plurium nomina, interpositis parariis, facit: ille non est INTERROGATIONE contentus, nisi rem manu suâ tenuit." Surely this cannot mean that the person in question is not contented with the use of a certain figure of rhetoric, unless he has got actual possession of the thing in question. It *must* mean that he is not contented with the security offered by the regular form of contract by question and answer, but insists upon actual possession. Now here, according to the ordinary rule, *interrogamentum*, which does not exist, would have been a more suitable word than *interrogatio*, which has to do its duty. And the contract in baptism was formerly made, as now, by question and answer; ἀποτάσσει τῷ Σατανᾷ; ἀποτάσσομαι. συντάσσει τῷ Χριστῷ; συντάσσομαι. Surely it was the merest chance, whether the whole ceremony, consisting of question and answer, should take its name from that part of it which involved the questions, or that which involved the answers. And in common parlance ἐπερώτημα, the more suitable Greek form, would in all probability commend

itself to the use of people *not* lawyers, while the professional pedantry of the lawyers would make them keep to the less suitable form *ἐπερώτησις*, because it corresponded exactly to the legal Latin term *stipulatio*. So that *ἐπερώτημα* never gained much currency, and in spite of its real propriety, appears now as a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*.

But a difficulty is raised about the use of the preposition *εἰς*. It is said that there is no satisfactory authority for *ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεὸν* in the sense of a contract or covenant *with* God. For we must clearly, from the mere order of the words, reject Œcumenius's method of drawing *εἰς Θεὸν* to *συνειδήσεως ἀγαήθης*. But there is no need of any such translation. The covenant in baptism is not made directly *with* God, but *with* the Church, and with ultimate *reference to* God; the very sense which would naturally be expressed by the preposition *εἰς*.

But why use so rare and out of the way a word as *ἐπερώτημα*? Perhaps in St. Peter's day the word was not so rare in common parlance, as now appears from its scarcity in written documents. Or more probably the Christian public in general, and St. Peter in particular, had a good reason for employing some such word, which is not very difficult to imagine. The proper term for a covenant, *διαθήκη*, had attained such tremendous import from our Lord's description of his own blood as that of the New *διαθήκη*, that it would naturally be appropriated to the grand covenant made upon the cross with, and on behalf of the whole human race. Naturally, therefore, would people seek for a new word to express the individual's entrance into that covenant. And what more suitable words than the legal *ἐπερώτησις* and its cognate, though rare sister form *ἐπερώτημα*, could have been found, exactly expressing as they did, and do, the nature of the transaction?

Let us not treat St. Peter as we know we should never be allowed to treat Aristotle, or Plato, or any other respectable writer, but let us at any rate give him the benefit of the doubt, as we are bound to do to the lowest criminal in our law-courts, and allow that he may have used a word in the ordinary technical sense of a closely allied and cognate form, rather than convict him, to the great joy of the semi-infidels of the present day, of illogical writing, for which we should at once condemn and ridicule any writer not included in the sacred volume.

Baptism saves us, says St. Peter. What is it in baptism that saves us? Not the mere outward application of water to the body, but the making of an honest covenant or contract with God by the appointed form for the individual's appropriation of the general covenant, made once for all in Christ. Baptism

saves us ; but in what sense ?—τῇ ἐλπίδι or κατ' ἐλπίδα, IN hope. And God grant that we may all be enabled to realize that blessed hope in this life, and to enjoy the substance of it in the life to come !

1 JOHN III. 20.

A cursory glimpse at any respectable commentator will shew the difficulty of this passage. Some take ὅτι ἐὰν as = δ ἐὰν or ὅτι ἂν, for which the only authority in the New Testament is a various reading πᾶν ὅτι ἐὰν in Col. iii. 23. Others think that ὅτι is repeated here as in Eph. ii. 11, 12, in the sense “that,” though the repetition there is calculated to assist, while here it is simply calculated to mislead the reader. Others translate grammatically but very contortedly, “Because, if our heart condemn us, because God is greater than our heart, he also knoweth all things.” None of these explanations appearing satisfactory, is there any other to be found ? We hope so. We have frequent instances of ἀποσιώπησις after hypothetical particles ; why should we not have one here ? The translation would then run as follows ; “Because if our heart condemn us [we cannot have any confidence toward God, ver. 21] because God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.” Thus a reason is given for the importance of “persuading” our hearts by the practice of love, which is the subject matter of the preceding verse. And the aposiopesis is supplied from what follows ; or it might be supplied from the preceding verse to much the same effect. Instances of aposiopesis are : Acts xxiii. 9, rejecting the additions of the *textus receptus* ; Mark vii. 11, where the hypothetical particle is ἐὰν as here, etc. Or the aposiopesis might be filled up by “we are bound,” as in Mark vii. 11.

1 JOHN V. 20.

A difficulty is presented by the article. We should expect ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος. But ζωὴ αἰώνιος was probably an expression in so frequent use as practically to be treated as a single word, and hence the apparent solecism. There are two somewhat similar instances in the received text of 1 Cor. x. 3, 4 : Πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πόμα πνευματικὸν ἔπιον, where both βρῶμα πνευματικὸν and πόμα πνευματικὸν are treated as single words, otherwise in strict grammar the two adjectives ought either to have preceded their substantives, or to have been themselves preceded by the article. The most probable text, however, in the passage of 1 Cor. leaves us only one of these instances : Πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα.

A. H. W.

MARCUS ANTONINUS A PERSECUTOR.

(Concluded from Vol. II. (New Series), p. 127.)

III. *That the persecution was carried on by his orders and edicts.*

SOME critics fancy they have gained their point, and fully cleared Antoninus of the charge of persecution, if they can prove that he never published any edicts against the Christians. But this is a very wrong conclusion. For if all religions, but the established one, were forbidden by the laws of Rome, and the edicts of former emperors; and if he suffered those laws to continue in full force, and to be put in execution against the Christians, which he might have repealed or suspended whenever he pleased, it is a certain sign that he approved them. And this alone were enough to entitle him to the character of a persecutor, though he had never enacted any new ones. Give me leave, since we are upon this subject, to take a short view of the state of the Roman laws, with respect to foreign religions, which is necessary to give light to our present enquiry.

2. Cicero (*de Legib.*, ii. 8, 10) in his system of religious laws, which he owns to have copied from the laws of Numa, or the old customs of Rome, begins with a prohibition of new gods and new religions, which were consequently forbidden by the old laws of Rome. And there are frequent examples in the Roman story, under the commonwealth, where the exercise of all foreign religions was prohibited, as you may see in Valerius Maximus (lib. i., chap. iii.), in Livy (iv., 30; xxv. 1), and in the case of the Bacchanalia (*Ib.*, lib. xxxix.), and on many other occasions. After the ruin of the commonwealth this grew to be a maxim of state under the emperors. Mæcenas, in his speech to Augustus, advises him in the most pressing terms, to give a check to the growth of all new religions, and to compel all men to comply with the national worship (Dio., p. 490). The whole scheme of government laid down by Mæcenas, and consequently this maxim amongst the rest, was, as Dio assures us (p. 492), pursued by Augustus or his successors; and, in all likelihood, gave a fatal rise to all the succeeding edicts against the Christians. As another proof of this matter, Constantine (*Orat. ad Sanct. cœtum*, chap. 20) in his wonderful exposition of Virgil's fourth eclogue, tells us that the poet had wrapped up that famous prediction of our Saviour in dark and obscure terms, for fear of incurring the penalties of the laws against all innovations in the established religion. It would be needless to produce more authorities, as I easily could, to prove so certain

a truth, that all foreign religions were prohibited by the standing laws of the empire.

3. Besides the novelty of our religion, which the heathens thought crime enough in all conscience, there were some particular forms and circumstances in the worship and discipline of the Christians, that were contrary to law, and which exposed them to the highest penalties. In this number, to omit many others, were their nightly meetings, and their forming themselves into churches, and congregations. Nocturnal meetings on the account of religion were not allowed by the Romans, as we know from Dionysius Halicar. (lib. ii., p. 68), nor upon any other occasion, as we are told by Porcius Latro (*Declam. contra Catalin.*, p. 233), who affirms that they were forbidden by the twelve tables, and punished with death by the Gabinian law. The same is confirmed by Livy, who makes it one of the principal articles in the charge against the Bacchanals (xxxix. 14, 15). Their assemblies, or conventicles, as we are sure from Pliny's epistle, fall within the description of the laws against Heteria or Collegia, which were all one, as we know from the *Digests* (lib. xlvii., tit. 22, chap. iv.), and from Dio. (p. 66, 496). The Collegia or companies of artificers, instituted by Numa (Plut., p. 130), and others erected by the commonwealth, were allowed by the law; but private societies set up without public authority were all condemned as illegal, and dangerous to the state; and there are many examples of their being suppressed, both under the commonwealth and the emperors. In Cicero's time they were dissolved by order of the senate; and he brings a heavy charge against Clodius for reviving them (*Cic. in Pison*, chap. iv., *Ascon. Pedianus*, b., p. 66; *Ascon. Pedian. ad Orat. pro Cornelio*). They were all broken by Julius Cæsar except the old ones (Suet., chap. xlii.), whose example was followed by Augustus (Suet., chap. xxxii.) They were abolished by Claudius (Dio., p. 669) and by Nero (*Jac. Ann.*, 14, 17), and severe edicts were issued against them by Trajan, as you may see in Pliny's epistles. And that the standing law of the empire was against them, under Antoninus, we are sure from Celsus (apud Orig., p. 3) and afterwards (Dio., *Ib.*) The same authors will tell you that they were suppressed for reasons of state, which appear very plausible. For they were considered, especially religious ones (Dio., p. 490) as factious combinations, and nurseries of sedition and rebellion, that threatened danger to the authority of the prince and the peace of the empire. The laws that were made against these Collegia were all considered as levelled at the Christians, as we know from the confession of the apostates in Pliny, who told him they had abandoned Christianity ever

since the publication of his edicts against the Heteria. Marcianus (*Digest. ib.*) assures us that it was part of the emperor's instructions to the provincial governors, to suppress the conventicles; which is confirmed by Pliny: "Secundum mandata tua—Heteria esse vetueram." And how severely all were punished, who lifted themselves in these illicita Collegia, we know from Ulpian (Dio., *ib.*) So that all the proconsuls were, in effect, obliged by their orders to persecute the Christians. Now if the Christians were liable to the penalties of all those laws, and Antoninus barely sat still and permitted them (as I have proved he did) to be let loose with their utmost severity against the Christians, without checking or restraining their course, as he might have done whenever he pleased, it is a demonstration that he approved them; and consequently he has as good a right to be styled a persecutor as if he had originally enacted them.

4. But I have no need to have recourse to this expedient. I have proofs enough that he persecuted the Christians by laws of his own making, which I shall produce hereafter. But before I enter upon this subject, give me leave to examine Mr. Dodwell's arguments to the contrary, which are built on the authority of Lactantius and Tertullian. The first of these authors does, I own, affirm that the church "nullos inimicorum impetus passa," etc. (chap. iii.) from Domitian down to Decius. But this proves not only that Antoninus was no persecutor, but that there was no persecution under his reign: which is giving the lie to all the ancient monuments, to the acts of Polycarp, and the Lyons martyrs, to all the church historians and to every apologist of that time, not one excepted. By the same rule there was no persecution under Trajan, against the authority of Pliny, the acts of Ignatius and Eusebius (iii. 33). Nor under Antoninus Pius, though we have the express testimony of Justin, who lived in that time, to the contrary. At that rate Severus's persecution is all a fable, though we have proofs of it beyond all exception, from the apologists of his reign, Clemens, Tertullian, and Origen; to say nothing of Eusebius (vi. 1) and Spartianus (in Severo, chap. xvii.) Shall we, in complaisance to Lactantius, give up all our ancient monuments, or give his hypothesis the name it deserves? The design of his book, as appears from the title, was to prove that all the persecutors died a violent death. To make way for this supposition, which was to be maintained right or wrong, all the persecutors who died peaceably in their beds, as Trajan, the Antonini and Severus, were to be struck out of the list. "Mentiendum erat," says his editor Tollius, "ut persecutoribus omnibus tristem obtigisse mortem probaret," which reflection is not more severe than true.

5. Tertullian had just such another hypothesis to serve, which is of equal truth with the former. His business was to prove that the Christians were persecuted by the bad emperors, and protected by the good: the reverse of that proposition is nearer the truth: for if you will look over the roll of the persecutors, you will find that seven of the ten were, in other respects, the best princes that ever ruled the empire. Antoninus Pius, he says, enacted no such laws against the Christians: which I have already proved false, by a witness of unquestionable credit. By his mistake in this article you may guess at his exactness in the rest. He clears Adrian from the same charge, though Sulpicius (ii., 46) numbers him among the persecutors, and says, he set up idols in the place of our Saviour's passion, "*perimendæ Christianorum fidei causa.*" And Cassiodorus (*Chron.*) plainly intimates that he had been a persecutor. Add to this his contempt of all foreign religions (Spartian, chap. xxii.) and his scornful character of the Christians in his letter to Servianus, which bears date long after his letter to Fundanus, which is the only ground upon which Eusebius makes him a favourer of the Christians; and which I take (and I am not singular in my opinion) to be as errant a juggle as that of Antoninus, though the conveyance be a little more cleanly. I am confirmed in this opinion of Adrian by the mock oracles of the Sibyls, which being made after the event, are not prophecies but histories; and consequently are of better authority than if they were genuine. He is there drawn with a very ill character for his love of magic, mysteries, etc. Nor can I guess to what the *ἅπαντα σεβάσματα λύσει* alludes, unless it be meant of his prohibition of the Christian and Jewish religions; which last we are sure of from Spartianus (chap. xiv.) (vide *Orac. Sibyll.*, lib. viii., p. 367, Ed. Opsop.) After all, the clause on which Mr. Dodwell's argument turns, is of suspected credit: for some copies instead of "*nullus Verus impressit* (Tert. *Apol.*, chap. v.) read Severus, and the whole clause is wanting in Eusebius's translation, which is older than any MS. now extant. But allowing him all he asks, it is plain that Tertullian had no other authority for the opinion but Antoninus's letter to the senate, after the miracle of the thundering legion and his edict to the assembly of Asia, both which I have proved to be manifest counterfeits, and consequently his testimony deserves no credit, especially when I have so many proofs to the contrary, of unquestionable authority, which I shall now begin with.

6. The persecution of Antoninus is reckoned by all the church historians among the ten persecutions. (Euseb. *Chron. Hieronymi Catalog. in Polycarpo. Sulpicius Severus*, ii. 46. *Aug.*

de Civit. Dei, xviii. 52 ; *Orosius*, viii. 15 ; *Historia Misc.*, x., 15, etc.) “Ab Antonino facta est,” says Augustinus (*Ib.*) “Persecutiones imperavit,” says the *Hist. Misc.* (*Ib.*) “Præcepto ejus extiterunt,” says Orosius (*Ib.*) Here are three positive authorities that charge the persecution home upon Antoninus.

7. My next argument is taken from two edicts of M. Antoninus produced by Baronius, which he very rightly supposes to relate to the Christians. By virtue of the first edict, a person was banished for predicting the rebellion of Cassius, “et alia quibus animi perturbarentur.” Ulpian (from whose first book, *De Officio Proconsulis*, Baronius took this relation) adds the reason of this edict, “Non debere impune ferri hujusmodi homines, qui sub obtentu, et monitu Deorum, quædam vel renunciant, vel jactant, vel scientes effingunt.” It is highly probable this is aimed at the Christian prophets; because Ulpian, in that very book, had collected all the rescripts against the Christians, as I formerly observed. By the other edict, which is taken from Modestinus, in the *Digests* (lib. xlviii., tit. i., chap. xxx.) the same punishment is enacted against all “qui aliquid facerent quo leves hominum animi superstitione Numinis terrerentur.” This edict bears probably the same date with the former, at least it is certain that it was published after the death of Verus, because his name does not appear at the head of it. And it is no wonder the Christians were charged with awing men’s minds with the Superstitio Numinis, or superstitious fears of the divinity, since the religion, not only in the writers of those ages, but in public monuments is styled Superstitio Nova, as in an inscription under Nero (*Scaliger de Emend. Tempor.*, p. 471), and Superstitio Christi, in another under Dioclesian, of which I shall say more hereafter. There is a law still extant in Julius Paulus (*Recep. Sentent.*, lib. v., t. xxi.) who flourished under Caracalla, and which every body allows to be levelled at the Christians, that may give some light to the meaning of those edicts. “Qui novas religiones inducunt—ex quibus hominum animi moveantur, honestiores deportantur,” etc.

8. But what was there, you will say, so frightful in the principles of the Christians to alarm men’s minds with such terrible fears and apprehensions? In the first place, their preaching up the day of judgment and hell-torments, which were considered by the heathens as mere scarecrows and bugbears, contrived, as they pretended, to make way for the propagation of their sect, by working on the fears of the rabble (*Justin. Apol.*, ii. p. 24; *Orig.*, p. 120, 167). In the next place, their giving out that the end of the world and the consummation of all things, was at hand; which was the current doctrine of the age among the

heretics and the Catholics, as you may see in Mr. Dodwell, who has made a large collection of authorities upon that subject (*De Fortit. Mart.*), and Celsus upbraids the Christians of his time with it (Apud Orig., p. 37). Add to this the Christian prophecies that were so rife in that reign of wars, tumults, and other public disasters, as of Maximilian the Montanist, at the end of Antoninus (Euseb., v., 16), Celsus (*Ib.*) And the heathens frequently reproached them for these seditious predictions, as we learn from the Philopatrîs, which you place under the same reign, though I think it much later. But nothing more justly alarmed them than the oracles of Hystaspes and Sibylla, which last foretold that Rome should be ruined as a judgment for the persecutions in the 948th year of the city. This sum is made up out of the numeral letters in *Ρωμην*, and is coincident with the 195th of Christ (*Orac. Sibyllina*, lib. viii., p. 375; vide Lactant., viii., 15, 25). It is no wonder if a prophecy, whose accomplishment was so near at hand, made a strange impression on the minds of the people. The heathens very well knew that these oracles were foisted in by the Christians, and roundly charged it upon them (Lactant., iv., 15; Cels. *ap.* Origin, p. 369; *Constant. Oratio ad Sanc. Cætum.*, chap. xix.) which accounts for the *Scientes effingunt* of Ulpian; and the foregoing words, “*sub obtentu et monitu Deorum*,” do agree as well to the Christians, though at first sight it seems otherwise. For the generality of the Christians at that time did not believe the sibyl to have been inspired by God Almighty, but the devil, as appears from Celsus (*ap.* Orig., p. 272), who mentions a sect or party of Christians that were styled *Sibyllitæ*, from their believing Sibylla to have been a prophetess that is divinely inspired: which shews that the contrary opinion was the prevailing one at that time. And Lactantius (*Instit.*, vii., 18) expressly says that Hermes, Hystaspes, and the Sibyls, “*ex instinctu dæmonum cecinerunt*,” which is the same with the *monitu Deorum* in Ulpian. The critics, except some few that are not worth minding, are all agreed that the Christian Sibylline verses were forged in the interval between Adrian and the death of M. Antoninus; for we have no mention of them in the Christian writers earlier than that time; nor do any of the predictions concerning the succession of the emperors reach lower than that period. And for all these reasons I am fully persuaded that Antoninus, when he wrote these edicts, had, with the other prophecies, these oracles chiefly in view.

9. I am confirmed in this thought by a remarkable passage in Justin’s first apology (p. 87, Ed. Grabe), where he says it was a capital crime under Antoninus Pius to read the prophecies

of Hystaspes and Sibylla and the other (heathen) prophets. I am not ignorant that some great critics have questioned the authority of Justin in this matter, and pretend that he has confounded the common oracles of the Sibyls that were abroad in the world, with the private ones that were concealed by the state, and which it was made death to divulge. Nor do I know what answer Halloix and Montague, to whom Grabe refers us, have made to this objection. But without their help, I can very easily defend him. In the first place, to make this objection of any weight, they must equally extend it to the prophecies of Hystaspes, which Justin sets on the same foot with the Sibyls, and which every body knows were never valued or regarded by the state, much less were they preserved in their archives among the *æterni fatalia pignora regni*. So that in the case of Hystaspes there could be no room for such a mistake; and yet Justin says his prophecies were prohibited. And why, by the same rule, might not those of the Sibyls that were in private hands be forbidden; since it is certain from Lactantius (viii. 15) that the subject of both of them was alike? It is manifest from what follows, nor do these critics deny it, that Justin meant that set of the Sibylline oracles the Fathers made use of (which is in good part the same with the modern collection, as appears from its agreement with most of their citations), because he himself had read them, for this can never be understood of the state oracles, to which no man but the proper officers could have access. These oracles were of the same stamp with the prophecies of Mother Shipton, Lilly, and Nostradamus, which last was once in as high reputation as ever the Sibyls were, though I believe he has now lost all credit with his admirers, since the only prophecies in his book that are fixed to a certain date, viz., the year 1700, have proved notoriously false (see his prophecies, p. 31, 139).

10. Since this is evidently the meaning of Justin, why should the fact he relates appear so very extraordinary? Are there not frequent examples in the Roman history of their calling in and burning the *Libri Fatidici*? (Livy, xxv., 1; xxxix., 16). Was there not a vast number of them destroyed by Augustus? (Suet., chap. xxxi.) And did not Tiberius absolutely forbid them? (Tacit. *Ann.*, vi., 12.) Was it not very natural for so jealous a state as Rome under the emperors, to be alarmed at predictions that threatened ruin to the empire? Did not they well know that prophecies are oftentimes the causes of the events they foretell? And had they not some ground to suspect that they were framed to possess men's minds with jealousies of sudden turns and changes, or to prepare them for new revolutions?

And was not all this foundation enough for severe edicts? But there is another surprising coincidence that adds strength to this argument. There was an old prophecy of the Sibyls handed about (Dio., p. 616) by which Rome was to be ruined in the 900th year of the city, which falls in with the 147th of Christ, in which year Justin wrote this apology; for he dates it (p. 90) in the 150th year of Christ, which by the way of reckoning in these times, as Pagi rightly observes (*ad Ann.*, cxlviii., 5) concurs with the 147th of the vulgar era. Pagi indeed says it was presented in the first year of Antoninus Pius, before Marcus had the title of Cæsar, because Justin had not given him that style in the inscription of his apology. But Pagi might have observed that he had given him as high a title, viz., that of βασιλεὺς, in the body of the apology, which was never bestowed on a private person (p. 26), which is a sufficient answer to his objection. Now could there ever be more occasion for such edicts than in the critical year to which a mock prophet had fixed the downfall of the empire? From what has been said it seems very plain that Justin had in his eye that medley of heathen, Jewish, and Christian prophecies that were collected into a body by some Christian of the second century, and passed under the name of the Sibylline oracles; at which the two edicts of Antoninus were in all probability levelled, as well as this law of Antoninus Pius.

11. My next argument is taken from a memorable passage in Capitolinus (chap. xxi.) which I formerly took notice of, “Deorum, cultum diligentissime restituit.” Deorum, or Numinum cultus, in the language of the age in which Capitolinus wrote, which was Diocletian’s, and in the following ages, signified the whole system of the heathen religion, *i.e.*, heathenism or Paganism as we now call it. It is in this sense Lactantius has so often used this phrase, especially in his institutions (l. v.) So has Marcelinus (l. xxii., chap. v.; l. xxv., chap. iv.), the *Histor. Miscella*, Arnobius (ii., 43) and others, in opposition to the *Dei Cultus*, or the religion of the Christians. This interpretation of the words is wonderfully confirmed by an inscription published in Gruter, Ariosti, Cuperus, etc., which was set up in memory of Diocletian’s mock triumph over the ruin of Christianity, and concludes with these remarkable words, “Superstitione Christi ubique deleta,” etc. “Deorum cultu propagato.” These two passages are exactly parallel with each other; for there is no difference between propagato and restituito, since there was no other way of propagating the heathen religion but by restoring it to those who had abandoned it, *i.e.*, the Christians; for the Jews were never persecuted by Diocletian

or Antoninus, and the rest of the world were all heathens. This affair was transacted in the tenth year of Antoninus, when the *quinquennalia* of Commodus's *Imperium Casareum* were celebrated. And every body knows that at these solemnities the persecution always ran highest. At the same time the empire was distressed by war, pestilence, and other calamities. And at such junctures it was the usual refuge of the heathens to appease the anger of the gods by the blood of the Christians, to whose Atheism and impiety all public disasters were ascribed. And to crown all, Melito, who presented his apology that year, complains that the persecution was then carried on in Asia by virtue of edicts newly issued forth. From all these circumstances put together, I am fully persuaded that this sentence of Capitolinus can be understood in no other tolerable sense, but that Antoninus restored the heathen by persecuting the Christian religion.

12. My next witness is Melito (*ap.* Euseb., iv., 26) who tells the emperor there was a violent persecution raised by new edicts in Asia, and that their enemies took advantage of those edicts to treat them with the most barbarous cruelties. You see he is very positive that such edicts were published. He adds, "if this is done by your order," etc., from whence some critics would conclude that Melito questioned whether they were published by his order or not. But this is a very false inference; for it was the interest of the cause he was maintaining to approach the emperor with the softest language, and the most artful application. And he has shewn the address of a true orator in not bluntly charging him as the author of those cruelties; and his praising him afterwards for his favourable inclination to the Christians (though not true, as I have proved at large) was a dexterous way of bespeaking his favour. If the proconsul had published such edicts against the emperor's commands, it would have been no secret to Melito, who in such a case would have openly charged him with the breach of orders, and appealed to the emperor for justice against him. But there can be no room for such a supposition to any man that considers that the proconsuls acted by a limited authority, pursuant to the emperor's mandates or instructions, as is manifest from the preamble of Justinian's seventeenth novel and Pliny's epistle. Nor is it possible to conceive that they would so far exceed the bounds of their commission, as to forge edicts in the emperor's name against his orders, which they must answer with their heads at the return. You may as well suppose that the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, or the judges in their circuit, would forge a statute for hanging or burning the Dissenters. I confess there is an instance against me of the Popish clergy, who under

Richard II. forged an act of parliament for the punishment of heretics; but I have not heard that the laity in any age, or of any religion, were ever so wicked.

13. My next proof is drawn from a remarkable passage in Athenagoras (p. 17), which I shall set down, as it is very happily paraphrased by the Oxford editor. Having vindicated the Christians from the charge of infant-murder, etc., he adds, "you yourselves (speaking to the emperor) do in effect acquit us of those crimes, by forbidding all agreement between us and the heathens. For were we really such monsters as we are represented, there could be no occasion for such an order, for the heathens would shun us of their own accord." The critics are agreed, and it is evident beyond denial, that Athenagoras alludes to Antoninus's edict against the Christians. If you confine the words *κελεύοντες μὴ ὁμονοεῖν* to the narrowest sense they will bear, it is a prohibition to the heathens to embrace the Christian religion, and consequently it is enacting a persecution against the new converts. If you extend them to the largest sense, which seems the most natural one, his forbidding all friendship and commerce between the heathens and the Christians, the intention of the law was to prevent the spreading of the Christian religion, by cutting off all intercourse between them and the pagans. Nor will such an edict appear strange to any man who considers that the heathens, in many places where the popular calumnies against the Christians prevailed, declined all manner of correspondence with them (Orig., p. 294; Epiphan., p. 104; *Acta martyrum Lugdun*). But understand the sentence as you please, in the narrowest, or the largest sense, which includes the former, it is manifestly part of the emperor's edict against the Christians. And though we are not told what punishment followed the breach of this law, yet since, as Livy rightly observes (x. 9), it is ridiculous in a corrupt age to suppose a prohibition without a penalty, it follows, of course, that it was a penal law, and consequently enacted a persecution against the Christians.

14. My next witness is Epiphanius (p. 476, 7), where he gives a short character of Bardesanes, who, he says, lived under Antoninus, not him who was styled Pius, but Verus, by whom he means M. Antoninus, as appears from p. 637, where he twice calls him Antoninus Verus, and from his *Ancoratus* (p. 63), and *de Ponder and Mensur* (p. 174) and never gives the name of Antoninus or Verus to his brother Lucius, though he mentions him more than once. The same is confirmed by Eusebius (iv. 30), who places him at the end of M. Antoninus; and in his *Chronicon* first takes notice of his flourishing age after the death of Lucius

Verus. And St. Jerome (*Catal. in Bardesanes*) makes him dedicate his book against astrological fate to M. Antoninus. Epiphanius adds, that Apollonius the friend of Antoninus (the same, as Petavius rightly observes, whom I have described, Prop. i., 3) pressed Bardesanes to abjure his religion, in such a manner as almost set him in the rank of a confessor, to which he returned this wise and resolute answer; that he did not fear death, which, though he should not contradict the emperor's command, was one time or other unavoidable. From his being considered as a kind of confessor, and from this answer, it evidently appears that Apollonius threatened him with death unless he turned heathen; and that his persisting in his religion was in contradiction to the emperor's commands. Now I would fain know how he came to be in danger of suffering martyrdom for disobeying the emperor's commands, in refusing to renounce his religion, if the persecution had not been set on foot by the emperor's orders. The consequence is so certain that it will admit of no dispute. Eusebius (iv. 30) fixes the persecution, upon the subject of which he says Bardesanes wrote several books, and from whence in all probability Epiphanius took this religion, to the end of Pope Soter, which, by his reckoning (*Chronicon*), was in the sixteenth year of Antoninus, which agrees very well with Capitolinus (chap. xxv. 6) and Dio (p. 813) who tell us, that after the rebellion of Cassius was suppressed he took a progress that year into the eastern provinces, where Bardesanes resided, and where Apollonius might have this conference with him.

15. The rescript against the martyrs of Lyons I reserved till last, as the strongest argument of all, and never to be eluded. I once thought it unquestionable and superior to all objections. But since Mr. Dodwell, to level everything that lay in the way of his favourite paradox, "de paucitate martyrum," has given a new turn to this whole relation, give me leave to take a short view of this hypothesis, the sum of which may be reduced to this single proposition, "that the confessors of Lyons, being convicted of cannibal feasts, etc., by the testimony of their slaves, did not suffer, by virtue of Antoninus's rescript, as Christians, but as cannibals and barbarians." It is very plain that the persecution of Lyons was begun, and carried on by popular tumults and the city magistrates till the governor of the province took cognizance of the matter, and issued his warrants for apprehending the Christians. Among the rest, some of their heathen slaves were seized, who, to avoid the rack, invented those lies on the Christians. So that it is very evident the persecution was not owing to this discovery, but the discovery to the persecution.

Nor does Mr. Dodwell dispute it. He only alleges that this report, which was current among the heathens before the discovery, inflamed the rabble, and gave birth to the persecution, which opinion is not improbable. But I cannot find what use he can make of this concession in favour of the main point he contends for, that the confessors did not suffer as Christians, and consequently that Antoninus was no persecutor. Were not most of the other persecutions owing to the same calumnies? Does not Origen (p. 293) declare that they were invented by the Jews as early as Christianity itself? Does not Melito affirm that they gave a rise to the first persecution under Nero? (ap. Euseb., iv. 26) which is confirmed by Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44), who owns that though the firing of Rome was made the pretence of the persecution, the Christians rather suffered as objects of the public hate, which they had incurred by their crimes ("propter flagitia invisos"), which were the same they were afterwards taxed with. Melito adds as much of Domitian's persecution; and we are certain, from Pliny's epistle, that this calumny was as prevalent as ever under Trajan; not only from what Pliny says of the "flagitia nomini cohærentia," but from the confession of the apostate Christians, who honestly vindicated the innocence of the Christian feasts ("cibum—innoxium"), which there had been no occasion to have said if the contrary had not been charged on them by the heathens. Under the reign of the Antonini, you see, it is the main drift of Justin and the other apologists to clear the Christians from these crimes, in order to stop the persecutions which they had in great part occasioned. These reports continued under Severus, as we know from Tertullian's apology: and though they were pretty well worn out when Origen wrote, they were not entirely extinguished (Orig., p. 294). And under Diocletian's persecution they were revived with greater malice than ever (Lactant. Just., vii. 26). And some lewd women, who had formerly been Christians as they give out, were compelled, for fear of the rack, to witness them against the Christians (Euseb. ix. 5). Now to apply all this: if Mr. Dodwell's way of arguing be allowed to be conclusive, why, by the same rule, may not I acquit Nero and Domitian, with the other persecuting princes, from the charge of persecuting the Christians; since, agreeably to Mr. Dodwell's hypothesis, their edicts were not levelled at the Christians as such, but as homicides and barbarians? This paradox, as wild as it appears, can never be answered on his principles.

16. As for the other part of his supposition, that the confessors were convicted on the testimony of the slaves, I absolutely deny it. Their confession could never amount to a legal con-

viction of the Christians; for we know from the famous fragment of Irenæus, preserved by Œcumenius, and published by Grabe, that their evidence was all hearsay: and the Catechumens themselves, from whose mistaken talk, as the same author assures us, they took the hint of their information, had they appeared against the Christians could have been only second-hand witnesses: for they were never admitted to the private meetings of the Christians, where all those unnatural crimes, as the heathens gave out, were transacted. From whence it plainly follows that the emperor's sentence could never be grounded on the information of the slaves. But though their evidence did not come up to a fair and legal proof, yet it gave the heathens a fair handle to put the confessors to the torture, to make them confess the crimes they were accused of, as we know from the *Acts* and the same fragment of Irenæus. But after they had denied the fact, and stood the rack with invincible firmness, from that time whatever private opinion the heathens entertained of their guilt they were considered as innocent in the eye of the law, and no crime but Christianity in general was laid to their charge; as the *Acts* expressly testify. But the apostates (who after they had pronounced their religion were no longer regarded as Christians) were still considered as rogues and homicides; which charge could not be barely grounded on common fame, which threw that reproach on all Christians without distinction; nor on the testimony of the slaves, who had nothing to say of their own knowledge; and therefore it must be owing to their own confession, which is plainly implied in several parts of the *Acts*, though it is certain they had not accused the confessors, for otherwise the heathens would have charged both alike with these crimes. The pagans, you see, reproached them as mean and cowardly wretches, "Qui homicidarum quidem sibi ipsis crimen imposuissent," as Valesius renders; which is the true sense, though not a literal translation of the words. As another proof of this matter, Biblias, one of the apostates, for refusing to own this charge was put to the torture; and there is no doubt but the rest would have undergone the same fate, if they had not prevented it by a timely confession. There are some other hints in the *Acts* to the same purpose, as Valesius remarks in his notes. After this came the emperor's rescript to the governor, with directions that the confessors, though they had denied the fact, and were not *then* charged with it, should be put to death; and that the apostates who were charged with it, and, in likelihood, had confessed it, should be acquitted. Which sentence was accordingly executed. For the confessors were put to death, and the apostates, that persisted in their apostacy, were set at

liberty. Whereas, upon Mr. Dodwell's supposition, the reverse of all this ought to have happened; the confessors should have been discharged, and the apostates put to death. Pagi and Ruinart have brought some other arguments on this head; but I thought it needless to produce any more, after so full and clear a demonstration that the confessors suffered merely as Christians, and not as cannibals.

17. But there is an easier way of untying this knot, and confuting Mr. Dodwell's conceit. For common fame, that charged the Christians with infant murder in their meetings, did not consider it as a distinct crime from Christianity, but as a part of it. The critics are divided in opinion about the rise of this report: Mr. Dodwell thinks it came originally from the Carpocratians, whom he supposes to have been really guilty of it, upon the credit of Eusebius (iv. 7) and Epiphanius (p. 194); and from thence the calumny was fathered on the orthodox. But this opinion is not favoured by the old writers, who were the best judges. Justin, though he mentions it as a thing talked of in his time (*Apol.* i., p. 53), owns that he knew nothing certain of the matter. And the author of the *Acta Lugdun.* does in express terms acquit them and all mankind of the charge: and most of the arguments urged against this calumny, by Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and the other apologists of those times, conclude as strongly in favour of the heretics as the Catholics. The Carpocratians, though they were heretics, yet we ought to consider that they were men. To murder and eat an innocent infant, is a degree of cruelty beyond all credit; and I am loth, for the honour of mankind, to believe there were ever such monsters of our race. Human nature shrinks at such barbarities, and every reader shivers with horror at the bare mention of them. But to set this matter beyond dispute, we know from Origen, Melito, Tacitus, Pliny, etc., that this report was current among the heathens long before the Carpocratians were ever heard of; who did not appear in the world till the days of Adrian, which entirely destroyed this hypothesis. The most probable opinion is, that the Jews, who (as Origen says, p. 293, 4) first invented this fable in the infancy of Christianity, had the hint of it from the sacrament of our Lord's supper, where they had heard the body and blood of Christ were mystically eaten by the believers, and from thence took occasion to brand the Christians with these brutal banquets. I am confirmed in this thought by a parallel case in this very persecution at Lyons. For it is certain from that invaluable fragment of Irenæus, which I have so often cited, that the slaves who had overheard their masters discoursing in the same manner of the mystery of the eucharist, understanding

it in a literal sense, took it for granted that they feasted on a human body. And this mistake gave them a handle for their information against the Christians. This is confirmed by the authority of divers other fathers, who assure us that the heathens thought this cannibal feast the grand mystery of Christianity. and the initiating rite of our religion. Minucius Felix styles it “*de initiandis tirunculis fabula—detestanda*” (p. 87). It was the “*sacramentum infanticidii*,” according to Tertullian (ap. chap. vii.). And the “*initia ipsa nostræ religionis*,” according to Salvianus (*Lib. iv.*, p. 138, 9). From all this it appears evident beyond denial, that the pagans by this cannibal feast meant nothing else but the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, which they regarded as the initiating ceremony of our religion; because the Catechumens, as soon as they were baptized, in order to completely enter them in all the mysteries of Christianity, were immediately admitted to the eucharist as the highest and most solemn act of divine worship (Just. ap. i., p. 124, Ed. Grabe). So that Mr. Dodwell might as well have said, that the confessors did not suffer for being Christians, but for being baptized. From those premises there results this plain and necessary conclusion; that if the confessors of Lyons had been fairly and legally convicted of infant murder upon the testimony of those slaves, and that the emperor’s rescript had been grounded upon it (both which are manifestly false), yet notwithstanding, since the heathens considered this article of homicide as an essential part of Christianity, the martyrs, if they had suffered upon that indictment, must still have suffered as Christians, by virtue of this sentence; and, consequently, the persecution against them was carried on by the emperor’s orders.

THE EGYPTIAN DYNASTIES OF MANETHO.

1. Few persons would probably hesitate to admit that if we possessed the chronological work of Manetho in its original form, we should have information on which we could reasonably depend as to the duration of each Egyptian dynasty, and as to the interval between its commencement and a fixed point of time, for at least as far back as the expulsion of the Hyk-Shôs. On the other hand, few persons would venture to assert that any of the lists of kings, with the durations of their respective reigns, which have been handed down to us as those of Manetho, can be depended on as really his. The discrepancy which everywhere exists between these lists appears to most persons a sufficient reason for rejecting the authority of them all. This being the case, it becomes a question, whether any certainty is attainable in respect to Egyptian chronology. It is vain to appeal to the monuments. I do not say this with reference to the scepticism which still exists as to there being *any* monumental evidence which can be depended on as properly interpreted. Scepticism like this can only exist where the grounds of hieroglyphical interpretation have not been properly investigated. I say however, advisedly, that we do not yet possess, and that it is extremely unlikely that we ever shall possess, such monumental evidence as would enable us to construct a chronological canon.

2. The chronological value of the evidence which we possess is extremely small. The Egyptian kings dated their public acts, not from any fixed epoch, but by the years of their respective reigns. In a few instances the interval between events which occurred in recorded regnal years of different kings is recorded also; and when this is the case we can compute the interval between their accessions. We know in this manner that Ahmôs the Saite came to the throne forty years after Nekau, and Pemi fifty-two years after Shishonk III. In a few other instances, where the reign of a king overlapped that of his successor, and where the regnal years of both the existing kings are recorded together, the interval between their accessions can also be determined. In this manner I ascertained, many years ago, that the first year of T'usortasen II. was the thirty-third of his father, Amen-em-hè II.; and that the first year of the latter was the forty-third of his grandfather, T'usortasen I., whom he succeeded. The number of cases, however, in which intervals between the commencement of reigns can be determined with accuracy by either of these methods is so extremely small, when

compared with the entire number of reigns, as, in place of encouraging us to hope for ultimate success in constructing a perfect canon, to lead us to despair of even approximating to its construction.

3. In a few instances, but a few only, genealogies exist which link together by a known number of generations an earlier and a later reign. We have it on record, for example, that in the thirty-seventh year of Shishonk IV., which must have been one of the very last years of the twenty-second dynasty, a tablet was erected by a person who was ninth in descent from Shishonk I., the founder of the dynasty. Assuming that Osorkon I., his ancestor in the eighth degree, was of the same age when his father became king as he himself was when he erected the tablet, the duration of the dynasty would be exactly measured by eight generations; and it could not be very much more or very much less than this.^a There is, I believe, no instance in Egyptian history where a genealogical tablet gives such good chronological evidence as this; and yet how far is this from giving us accurate information! The dynasty lasted "*about* eight generations;" how many years should that be reckoned to be? In English history a generation has been on an average about 32 years. Between the birth of William the Conqueror and that of Queen Victoria, the twenty-fifth in descent from him, 792 years intervened. At this rate eight generations would occupy $253\frac{1}{2}$ years. In ancient times and in eastern countries the average was less. The interval between the births of Rehoboam and Jeconiah, the sixteenth in descent from him, was about 416 years, giving 208 for the eight generations. The highest sum of eight consecutive generations in the line of Rehoboam is 244 years, the lowest, 195. The genealogy to which I have referred may be regarded as conclusive against those who, relying on the statements attributed to Manetho by Julius Africanus, make the duration of this dynasty only 120 or even 116 years; and it harmonizes well with the reading "202 years," which I will hereafter shew to have been what Manetho really made it; but I would not venture to rely on this genealogy as conclusive against the views of Lepsius and Bunsen, who, with the knowledge of what it contains, have assigned to the dynasty 174 and 176 years respectively. We may assume 25 years as a probable average for a generation;

^a That Shishonk I. was not a very young man when he obtained the kingdom, and that Osorkon his son had then attained to man's estate, are evident from the monumentally-recorded fact (Nile statue, British Museum) that Osorkon, and not Shishonk himself, married the daughter of Psusennes, the last king of the twenty-first dynasty.

but even if the length of the dynasty had been accurately, instead of approximately, measured by eight generations, a large margin must be allowed on each side within which it might range without being decidedly at variance with what is stated in the genealogical inscription.

4. Neither is the evidence to be obtained from regnal dates to be implicitly relied on. Some persons seem to have thought that a chronological canon might be constructed by counting the highest regnal years of the successive kings which occur in the dates of tablets. But, on the one hand, we can never be sure that the highest date found is the highest that may have existed. The highest regnal year, for example, which has been found for Shishonk III. is his twenty-ninth year; and yet there is evidence, to which I have already adverted (§ 2), that he reigned fifty-two. On the other hand, in such cases of joint reigns as I have mentioned in the latter part of § 2, it is manifest that if the highest regnal years of all the kings were to be taken as the lengths of their reigns, the years in which two sovereigns reigned together would be counted twice over. Nor have we any right to assume that cases of this kind were few in number, or that the durations of these joint reigns were always small. There is a stèle at Leyden (V., 4) which has the double date of the forty-fourth year of T'usortasen I. and the second of Amen-em-hè II. There is another tablet (Sharpe, i., 83) which appears to be dated in the following year, the third of Amen-em-hè II. No second date accompanies this, but king T'usortasen I. is mentioned in the body of the inscription, and his name is followed by the addition "May he live!" which characterizes living kings; while his father's name has the usual addition "who hath spoken truth (or been justified)," which is characteristic of the dead. In this instance I suppose no one would question that T'usortasen I. was still alive; yet in a similar instance in the twenty-second dynasty, the validity of this conclusion is strenuously denied. In the Karnac inscription (Lepsius' *Auswahl*, 15) dated in the eleventh year of Takelut, king Osorkon, the grandfather of his wife, and, as I take it, his own father, is mentioned with the very same addition "May he live!" I shall have to return to the consideration of this clause (see § 57). I will only remark here, that it is at least possible that king Osorkon was actually alive in the eleventh year after his son had begun to reign in conjunction with him; nor should I be surprised at the discovery of a document dated during these eleven years, bearing the names and years of both the kings, or the name and year of Osorkon alone.

5. Another source of error in computation by regnal years

is the possible existence of double epochs at which reigns may be reckoned to commence. There may be cases in Egyptian history analogous to what occurred in the time of James I., or Charles II. In the former instance, a king who had reigned for sixteen years in Scotland from his mother's death, became king of England, and reigned over both countries for twenty-two years more. A chronologer who, possessing no historical information, should take as his guide dated documents only, might discover from English documents that the first year of Charles I. was only twenty-two years after the first of James I., and might come to the blundering conclusion that the reign of Mary of Scotland terminated when that of Elizabeth really terminated. This hypothesis would, of course, destroy the earlier synchronisms between Scottish and English history; and it might then occur to our supposed chronologer that the best way of setting matters straight would be to strike off twenty years or so from the long reign of Elizabeth. Absurd as this mode of proceeding must appear to persons acquainted with English and Scottish history, its absurdity would not appear to one who had only a few detached documents before him, relating to private affairs, although dated by regnal years. What I have supposed that this chronologer might have done is exactly parallel to what our best Egyptologists have done. A document is discovered which proves that the reign of Tirhaka as king of *Egypt* (reckoning from the death of Seti III.) was only twenty-seven years before the first of Psamitik I.; the false inference is drawn that his reign as king of *Ethiopia* (reckoning from the death of Shebetok, which was fourteen years earlier) began twenty-seven years only before that of Psamitik I. The consequence of this false inference is, that the conquest of Egypt by Shebek is made to fall a good many years after the conquest of Samaria; and as Hoshea, the last king of Samaria, is said to have made an alliance with Shebek, the anachronism thus produced is removed, not (as it ought to have been) by adding to the Egyptian chronology the fourteen years which had been improperly omitted, but by striking off twenty years from the reign of Manasseh of Judah, which is considered sufficiently long to admit of this reduction! It goes for nothing with the gentlemen who have made this *correction*, forsooth, of Egyptian chronology, that in the second book of Kings, Tirhaka is called king of Cush, or Ethiopia, a "Pharaoh king of Egypt" being spoken of as his cotemporary; that Herodotus speaks of Sethos as king of Egypt when Sennacherib invaded Palestine, and that Sennacherib himself speaks of having for his adversaries "kings of Egypt and the king of Ethiopia." All these proofs that the

invasion of Sennacherib took place while Tirhaka was king of Ethiopia, and before he had become king of Egypt, are disregarded; and to meet the supposed exigency of an Egyptian regnal date, Jewish, Assyrian, and Babylonian chronologies are all recklessly violated.

6. The other occasion in English history which I mentioned as what might give rise to a chronological blunder, is the reign of Charles II. Counting from the death of his father, from which he reckoned his regnal years, to his own death, he reigned thirty-six years; but in reality he began to reign in what he called his fourteenth year, thirteen years having belonged to the Commonwealth. So far as respects chronology, it does not matter whether the interval between the deaths of father and son be counted as thirty-six years of Charles II., or as thirteen years of the Commonwealth and twenty-three of Charles II.; but it would be a serious chronological error, into which however a person would be very likely to fall who had only detached regnal years to guide him, if this interval were counted as thirteen years of the Commonwealth and thirty-six of Charles II. Some instances are certainly to be met with in Egyptian history in which a chronologer would be likely to commit an error analogous to this; but I will not enter on the discussion of them here. I have said, I believe, quite enough to shew that the evidence furnished by the Egyptian monuments is quite insufficient for the construction of a chronological system. It may accredit, or it may shew the worthlessness of, dynastic lists—it may verify, or it may overturn, a chronological system otherwise constructed; but *of itself* it can produce nothing that can be relied on.

7. This being the case, it is evident that if a correct chronology of the Egyptian dynasties can be obtained at all, it must be obtained from the dynastic lists attributed to Manetho; a comparison of which in their present state of corruption may enable us to discover what Manetho really wrote. The problem to be solved is this:—Given the durations assigned to the dynasties and reigns by Africanus and Eusebius, and to the dynasties by the compiler of the Old Chronicle; to recover by legitimate criticism the durations originally assigned to them by Manetho himself; from which all the existing documents have been derived by misconceptions of Manetho's meaning, blundering attempts at correcting his supposed errors, and *subsequently to these*, deliberate falsifications, with a view to bring lists which appeared to be inconsistent with the received Biblical chronology into harmony with it. I believe that I have completely solved this problem. In the present article I give the durations

of the dynasties according to the restored text of Manetho, with such explanations as are necessary to the correct understanding of his chronological system; and I then gave the synchronisms by which the correctness of my restoration is, as I conceive, established. In a subsequent article it is my intention to fill up the outline which I have here drawn, by giving a restoration of the durations assigned to the several reigns by Manetho. In the meantime it is my wish that what I now publish should undergo the most searching criticism.

8. It will be observed that I go no further back than to the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty. Manetho himself, as will be seen, marks this as a point of chronological departure; and the data by which, as I conceive, his text can be confidently restored back to this point, fail as to earlier dynasties. I ought to remark also that I carefully distinguish in my investigation between two things which some enquirers have confounded, namely, the true chronology of the period, and the chronology of it according to the mind of Manetho. I have, in the first instance, sought to discover the latter, using no other data than the three corrupt lists which I have mentioned, and those Greek writings which guided those who prepared them in their corruptions. Thus my restoration of the text of Manetho stands *absolutely independent of Egyptian monumental evidence*. And yet it can scarcely be doubted that Manetho had correct information with respect to the period in question, and that even when he thought it necessary to deviate from historical truth, he adhered strictly to chronological truth. I mean to say that, though he might misrepresent *facts* in a manner analogous to that of an English historian, who, ignoring the Commonwealth, ascribed thirty-six years to Charles II. of England as his reign *de facto*, he always in his summaries of the reigns in the dynasties gave the correct sums; so that the commencements of the several dynasties are all truly given. Hence the synchronisms, by which I shew that the dates according to my system are correctly given, are evidences also of the correctness of my restorations of Manetho's text.

9. The restoration that I have given is, as I have said, wholly independent of Egyptian monumental evidence. I have, however, tested it as well as I could by this last; and I am not aware of a single fact, nor do I believe that any exists, which is established by monumental evidence, and yet inconsistent with my system. This is, however, a matter on which I challenge the most searching criticism. If any such supposed fact be produced, either in the April number of this Journal or in a private letter to myself, and if I cannot shew that the person

who produces it is mistaken in supposing it either to be established by monumental evidence or to be inconsistent with my restored chronology, I will admit that, however plausible my restoration may be, it is unsound. I have no expectation, however, that this will be the case; and I hope that in the July number I shall be able to give, together with a triumphant reply to my assailants, if any, a restoration of the duration of the reigns in the dynasties as originally given by Manetho. I hold this in reserve, until my restoration of the duration of the dynasties be sufficiently tested.

10. Let it be observed, however, that it is to *facts* alone that I will surrender my opinion. *Authority* will have no weight with me. I am perfectly well aware that almost all Egyptologists support a chronological system which is altogether opposed to mine. They think that the accession of Rehoboam to the throne of Judah, and that of Shishonk to the throne of Egypt, which almost immediately preceded it, took place considerably after the time assigned to them in the margins of our tables; and in this Sir Henry Rawlinson and Mr. Bosanquet agree with them. And they refer the exodus to the latter part of the nineteenth dynasty. I maintain, on the contrary, and I think demonstrate, that the accessions of Shishonk and Rehoboam were in 980 and 979 B.C.; and that consequently no curtailment of the reign of any of the kings of Judah is admissible; nor any such arrangement of the Persian reigns as Mr. Bosanquet proposes. I shew also that the Egyptian reign, in which Egyptologists place the exodus, did not commence till about 250 years before the death of Solomon! By *me* the exodus is placed at a far earlier period. This great diversity between my views and those which are generally entertained, renders it a matter of course that quotations from various eminent Egyptologists can be produced *ad libitum*, expressing opinions which, if taken as standards of truth, would prove me to be in error. Such quotations, however, being mere expressions of opinion, have not the slightest weight with me. Unless some monumentally-recorded fact can be produced, which is inconsistent with my chronological arrangement of the dynasties, I shall continue to hold that its inconsistency with the opinions of Egyptologists is no proof whatever that *it* is wrong; the fact being that the inconsistent opinions of Egyptologists are wrong. Again, as respects Sir Henry Rawlinson's canon. This is not a cotemporary document, but a compilation made by an unknown person in the reign of Assur-bani-bal. Its inconsistency with my restoration of Manetho, supported as this is by recorded astronomical observations, proves that the compiler of the canon was a blunderer;

and that the early dates which it is supposed to give are incorrect. Again, as to the Astronomer Royal, while I would cheerfully submit to him our astronomical questions generally, I except the two questions, which are linked together, of the date of the Medo-Lybian war, and the magnitude of the moon's acceleration. I protest against any argument against my restoration which may be drawn from its inconsistency with his notions, that the Medo-Lybian war was terminated by the eclipse of 585 B.C., and that the coefficient of T^2 in the mean elongation of the moon, was $12''\cdot192$, as Hansen makes it, or even more. On the contrary, I appeal to the monumentally-recorded eclipse, which I shall bring forward as furnishing *conclusive evidence* that the coefficient of T^2 is much less than this, and consequently that the moon's shadow in the eclipse of 585 B.C. could not have passed where the Astronomer Royal supposes that it did.

11. It is to facts monumentally recorded alone that I will yield; and if any one brings forward facts which he may conceive to be at variance with my views, I have to request that he will quote the precise fact monumentally recorded. There is very great temptation to quote, as a monumentally-recorded fact, what is not really so, but an inference from one; the suppressed premise of the enthymeme being one, of which the person who has drawn the inference has no doubt, but of which others may entertain very great doubts, which, in short, they may regard as positively erroneous. The extent to which this error has been committed by Egyptologists is really surprising. References to the evidence quoted should also be precise.

12. One word more of preliminary matter. The views put forward in this paper are not, so far as I am aware, held by any one but myself. Some of them I expressed so long ago as in March, 1856. See the *Literary Gazette* for that year, p. 111. I advanced further in a paper in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* for October, 1858, p. 126; and still further in a paper in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for 1861, vol. xviii., p. 378. In all these papers, while I was in the right direction and gradually approaching the truth, I admitted errors which kept me from attaining to it. My views are now matured. I have succeeded in completely removing the inconsistencies which, though they only introduced errors of small amount, disfigured my former papers. I have produced an arrangement of the dynasties which will, I flatter myself, be found to *run on all fours*; my former one, though much to be preferred to any that had been previously produced, *limping* in more places than one. As respects the medium through which I publish this restoration of Mane-

tho, I think a weekly journal would be objectionable; as in it I could not publish at once the entire of my system, so far as respects the dynasties, with the proofs of its truth. *The Journal of Sacred Literature* seems to be preferable to that of the Royal Asiatic Society, because the subject is closely connected with sacred literature; the chronology of the Israelites in Palestine, and particularly that of their kings, is as much my subject of discussion as that of the Egyptian dynasties; and the views of the early Christians as to Israelitish chronology have to be taken into account as an important means of restoring the corrupt text of Manetho.

13. The mode of proceeding by which I restore the original dynastic durations of Manetho includes a double criticism. These were depraved in the first instance by blundering Egyptian or Greek writers, who looked no farther than Manetho, and whose successive depravations of his numbers were the result of misapprehensions of his meaning in the first instance, and of injudicious attempts at restoring a text which they perceived to be faulty, at a subsequent period. Three texts were thus formed, which I will call A, B, and C, the last of them being the production of a person who had the two former before him, and who sought to reconcile their discrepancies. From these three documents, that attributed to Africanus, that of the Old Chronicle, and that of Eusebius were respectively derived, the process in each case being a process of deliberate falsification of the Egyptian text, grounded on non-Egyptian documents, with a view to establish synchronisms between dates given by A, B, and C, and dates supposed to be given by the non-Egyptian documents. The processes by which the lists of the supposed Africanus, the compiler of the Old Chronicle, and Eusebius, were obtained from the original list of Manetho, have to be reversed in our present proceeding. That is, we have, first, by a criticism in which non-Egyptian documents play a principal part, to recover the documents A, B, and C; and we have, secondly, by a criticism grounded on these three documents alone, to obtain the original text of which they were corruptions.

14. I begin with the first criticism, the object of which is from the three existing lists to recover the three lists A, B, and C; and I begin by remarking that in order that the result of the criticism may be satisfactory, the criticism must proceed on fixed and sound principles. In the first place, we have nothing to do with the question, What is the truth? Chronological truth is, I feel confident, contained in the original list of Manetho, but it is certainly not contained in any of the lists, A, B, and C. Nay, it is very possible that these may deviate from it

even more than the existing lists. Our present object is to distinguish non-Egyptian corruptions from what is Egyptian; whether the latter be the truth of Manetho, or the blunders of his followers. To distinguish what is Egyptian from what is non-Egyptian, I lay down the following canons:—

I. If a number occurs in two of the existing lists, it is Egyptian; the number in the third list may, or may not, be Egyptian. The three existing lists are independent of one another, having been corrupted by persons who sought to establish by their corruptions different synchronisms. It is, therefore, not to be supposed that two of them should have obtained the same numbers by their corruptions.

II. If a marginal note be appended to one of the lists, say A, which is inconsistent with that list, the marginal note is Egyptian, and probably Manetho's own, and the inconsistency arises from one or more non-Egyptian corruptions.

III. Where any of the lists contains or implies a synchronism with a non-Egyptian date, this synchronism has been produced by a corruption; the interval between the Egyptian date in the original list and the date which the compiler of the existing list believed to be the proper one having been added to, or subtracted from, some one of the Egyptian numbers, or having been divided into parts, which were added to, or subtracted from, some two or more of the Egyptian numbers.

It will be seen that each of the three existing lists contains a synchronism, produced by corruption, and that the three synchronisms are all different.

IV. Where a number that has to be added or subtracted in order to produce a synchronism is divided, it may be assumed that the division is so made as that all the changes but one are of the easiest and most obvious kind; that is to say, additions or subtractions of multiples of ten, or omissions of the units in a number, so as to reduce it to a multiple of ten.

V. Where a number is taken away from the duration of one dynasty and added to that of another, in order to correct a supposed non-Egyptian anachronism, the number so dealt with is probably a round number, that is, a multiple of ten.

I lay down these canons in order that it may be seen that my mode of proceeding is not an arbitrary one, and that the result at which I arrive is the only one that can be legitimately attained.

15. I will now consider what the synchronisms were which guided the persons who introduced into the lists non-Egyptian corruptions. Two of these are derived from the exodus of the Israelites; and it is therefore necessary to consider at what date

he early Christians placed this. St. Clement of Alexandria says expressly that the exodus took place 345 years before the renewal of the canicular cycle, which we know was in 1322 B.C. The date intended is therefore 1667 B.C.; a date which appears to have been that of all the early Christians, with the exception of Julius Africanus, who threw the exodus back 130 years. In the dynastic lists attributed to Africanus we find the accession of the eighteenth dynasty placed in 1667 B.C., a marginal note being added stating that this was also the date of the departure of the Israelites under Moses. From this Bunsen inferred that, when Clement placed the exodus in 1667 B.C., he meant that this was the date of the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, with which he erroneously supposed that the exodus synchronized.

I have not a copy of the *Stromates* within reach, but I believe that there is no proof that he believed the exodus to synchronize with the accession of the eighteenth dynasty. This, however, is immaterial; others certainly thought so. But what appears to me quite certain is that 1667 B.C. is given by him as the date of the exodus itself, and that it was obtained from the Bible, without any reference to Egyptian chronology. Instead of its being borrowed from Manetho, as Bunsen imagined, the list which bears the name of Africanus has suffered corruption, in order that it might be brought into harmony with the Biblical date of the exodus, which was assumed to be that of the accession of the eighteenth dynasty.

16. In order that it may be clearly seen that this date of 1667 B.C. is a Biblical one, and that the authority on which it rests may be made manifest, I will give the chronology of the two books of Kings, according to the early Christians, and according to the margin of the English Bible, in parallel columns; the difference between the two dates being given in a third column; and whenever this difference changes, I will explain the grounds of the change.

The Exodus	1667	B.C.	1491	B.C.	176
Building of the Temple	1027	"	1012	"	15 (a)
Accession of Rehoboam	990	"	975	"	15
" Abijam	973	"	958	"	15
" Asa	970	"	955	"	15
" Jehoshaphat . .	929	"	914	"	15
" Jehoram	904	"	892	"	12 (b)
" Ahaziah	896	"	885	"	11 (c)
" Athaliah	895	"	884	"	11
" Jehoash	889	"	878	"	11
" Amaziah	849	"	839	"	10 (d)
" Uzziah	820	"	810	"	10
" Jotham	768	"	758	"	10
" Ahaz	752	"	742	"	10
" Hezekiah	736	"	726	"	10

Accession of Manasseh	707 B.C.	698 B.C.	9 (<i>d</i>)
„ Amon	652 „	643 „	9
„ Josiah	650 „	641 „	9
„ Jehoiakim	619 „	610 „	9
„ Zedekiah	608 „	599 „	9 (<i>e</i>)

17 (*a*). The difference between the two dates is here diminished by 161 years, of which the main part 160 is due to the circumstance that in 1 Kings vi. 1 the early Christians read in their Bibles “six hundred and fortieth,” where our Bibles, following the present Hebrew text, read “four hundred and eightieth.” In the text of the LXX., as now received, we have “four hundred and fortieth,”—a corrupt reading made out of the true reading of the LXX. and the translation of the Hebrew text which Origen made for his *Hexapla*. The additional year of difference arose from the early Christians having counted 640 complete years, whereas the English Bible counts 480 current years, or 479 complete years.

18 (*b*). It is distinctly stated in 1 Kings xxii. 42, that Jehoshaphat reigned twenty-five years. In the margin of the English Bible this is reduced to twenty-two, on the strength of certain synchronisms between the reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel, which, according to the present Hebrew text, are inconsistent with his having reigned twenty-five years. The passages which give these synchronisms were translated into Greek by Origen for his *Hexapla*, and from that, as in many other instances, they have found their way into our present copies of the LXX. The original reading of the LXX. is, however, given also in these copies, and it fully supports the larger number of years assigned to Jehoshaphat in the passage already cited. After 1 Kings xvi. 28, the LXX., as uncorrupted, proceeds: “And in the eleventh year of Omri Jehoshaphat the son of Asa began to reign.” Then follows the passage which in our present Bibles stands as 1 Kings xxii. 42—50, substituting, however, in verse 49 “the king of Israel” for “Ahaziah, the son of Ahab.” After relating the succession of Jehoram, the LXX. proceeds as in 1 Kings xvii. 29, etc.; but in the beginning of verse 29 it reads, “And in the second year of Jehoshaphat king of Judah began Ahab,” etc.

19 (*c*). It is stated in both the Hebrew text and the LXX. that Jehoram reigned eight years. In the margin of the English Bible, however, only seven are assigned to him. The suppression of a year is, no doubt, due to the synchronisms which, as they now stand in the Hebrew, cannot be reconciled with one another without great difficulty, and without arbitrary assumptions of kings reigning in consort, and reigns being counted from different

epochs. I observe that the latter part of 2 Kings i. 17 is omitted in the LXX. It appears to be spurious. The Hebrew text in 2 Kings viii. 16 does not admit the translation given in the English Bible, which however is scarcely capable of a consistent interpretation. The only admissible translation would be, "And in the fifth year of Joram, the son of Ahab, king of Israel, and of Jehoshaphat king of Judah;" which is manifestly self-contradictory. Our present copies of the LXX. furnish us with no help. They contain a version of the Hebrew text, probably that of Origen taken from the *Hexapla*. The genuine reading of the LXX. is not given *also*, as it is in the First Book of Kings. Under these circumstances the only safe course is to have regard to the lengths of the reigns which are given, neglecting the corrupted synchronisms; and here we meet with no difficulty, for the two sets of numbers correspond. In the Biblical chronology of the kings of Judah, I take it that we have a chronological canon of the same nature as that of Ptolemy; as many years being assigned to each king as there were new moons of Nisan in his reign. On the contrary, a reign of a king of Israel was reckoned to include all the years in any part of which he was king. His first year was the civil—or, as some call it, the ecclesiastical year (beginning with the new moon of Nisan)—in which he came to the throne; while the accession of a king of Judah might be described, in reference to the reign of a king of Israel, either as the year corresponding to his first year, or as the year next before this. The following table will shew how the two sets of numbers of years assigned to the kings of Judah and Israel correspond. I prefix years B.C. at the new moon next after the vernal equinox of which the regnal years of the kings of Judah commenced. For the present these years B.C. may be regarded as arbitrary, and only approximate; but I will shew in the course of this paper that they are the true years, as fixed by astronomical observations. I begin with the accession of Omri in the thirty-first year of Asa, after the termination of the civil war. See 1 Kings xvi. 23.

B.C. 929	Thirty-first Asa	First Omri
„ 919	Forty-first Asa	Eleventh Omri
„ 918	First Jehoshaphat	Twelfth Omri and first Ahab
„ 917	Second Jehoshaphat	Second Ahab
„ 897	Twenty-second Jehoshaphat	Twenty-second Ahab and first Ahaziah
„ 896	Twenty-third Jehoshaphat	Second Ahaziah and first Joram
„ 894	Twenty-fifth Jehoshaphat	Third Joram
„ 893	First Jehoram	Fourth Joram
„ 886	Eighth Jehoram	Eleventh Joram
„ 885	First Ahaziah	Twelfth Joram

20 (*d*). The reigns of Jehoash and Hezekiah are expressly

stated to have lasted forty and twenty-nine years respectively ; but in the margin of the English Bible a year is struck off from each of them.

(e). The early Christian placed the accession of Zedekiah and the captivity of Jeconiah, which was in the same year, seventy years before the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, which all agree to have been in 538 B.C. They assumed this to be the true interval, believing that the prophecy of the seventy weeks' captivity referred to these limits. Archbishop Ussher transferred the earlier limit from the captivity of Jeconiah to an earlier captivity in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar. He assumed that this was 606 B.C., and that the year of Necho's expedition, in which Josiah was killed, was 610 B.C. In reality, however, this last event took place in 608 B.C.; the earliest date of which Egyptian chronology admits, as I will shew when I come to consider the separate reigns ; and the canon of Ptolemy fixes the accession of Nebuchadnezzar in 604 B.C. Archbishop Ussher thought that the canon gave the date of his father's death, and that he reigned two years in conjunction with him previous to 604 B.C. This, however, is an inadmissible hypothesis. Nebuchadnezzar's years must have been counted from the year when he became king. They were certainly counted from 604 B.C., and therefore he became king then. If he became king two years before his father's death, his father must have lived till 602 B.C. I believe that his father was the Labynetus of Herodotus, and that he was the king who intervened at the termination of the Lydian war in 603 B.C. The death of Josiah, and capture of Jerusalem by Necho, in 608 B.C., and the first captivity, at the beginning of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar in 604 B.C., appear to me to be fully-established chronological facts, as to which no rational controversy can exist. We may date the seventy years' captivity from the former, and make it to terminate at the capture of Babylon ; or we may date it from the latter, and make it to terminate at the death of Darius the Mede, placing this last in 534 B.C. I am not aware of there being any authority for preferring the received date of 536 B.C. to this. The question of the seventy years' captivity belongs to the department of theology rather than to that of chronology ; and its discussion does not lie within the compass of the present paper.

21. I have now shewn that the date of 1667, assigned to the exodus by St. Clement of Alexandria, and believed to be the true date by the early Christians generally, was a purely Biblical date, obtained by calculation from Biblical numbers, historical or prophetic. It appears to have been accepted by all the

early Christians, with the exception of Julius Africanus, who threw the exodus back 130 years. He is blamed for having done this by Georgius Syncellus, who frequently complains of his chronological blunders. It appears that while he adhered to the apostolical tradition, that the incarnation of Christ was exactly 5500 years after the creation, he omitted the generation of the second or post-diluvian Cainan, which is given in the LXX. as 130 years, and that he compensated for this omission by adding 110 years to the interval between the exodus and the foundation of the temple, and twenty more to the interval between that and the first year of Darius. The Syncellus is not very clear in his statements as to where this error was committed. It seems clear, however, that he placed the captivity of Jeconiah in 631 B.C., seventy years before the accession of Cyrus to the throne of Persia. Here then he added twenty-three years to the received chronology. *Somewhere*, therefore, between the building of the temple and the captivity of Jeconiah he must have dropped three years. It is a matter of no importance, however, where this loss was, or how it was occasioned.

22. Having now shewn what was the date of the exodus according to the early Christians generally, and what it was according to the peculiar views of Julius Africanus, I proceed to speak of the synchronisms believed to exist between the exodus and events in Egyptian history. Two opinions seem to have divided the early Christians, each of which has been brought to bear on one of the existing lists. Africanus imagined, as Josephus had done before him, and probably other Jews, who thought that it was creditable to their nation, that the Hyk-shôs were the Israelites, that their expulsion was an Egyptian mode of describing the exodus, and that, consequently, the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, which synchronized with the expulsion of the Hyk-shôs, ought to be referred to the Biblical date of the exodus. The other opinion, which was probably held by a much greater number of the early Christians, and which was subsequently adopted by the Syncellus, harmonized much better with the Biblical narrative. According to it, the exodus did not take place at the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty, but eighty years or upwards after it. The Israelites came into Egypt in the time of the shepherds. One of these was the Pharaoh that advanced Joseph; Ahmôs of the eighteenth dynasty, who expelled them, was the new king who knew not Joseph, and who commanded that the Hebrew infants should not be suffered to live. Aaron was born before this edict, and of course before Ahmôs came to the throne; and Moses, it is supposed, was born very shortly after his accession. The

exodus, it is said, took place when Moses was eighty years old. All, therefore, that was necessary in order to determine the exact interval was, as was supposed, to find the least interval, consisting of a complete number of reigns, extending from Ahmô's downwards, and exceeding eighty years. Now Josephus gives the reigns from Ahmô's down with very great apparent accuracy, not only the years but the months being stated; and it cannot reasonably be doubted that the list which Josephus gives was Egyptian, if not Manetho's own. According to this list, the first four reigns consisted of $25y. 4m. + 13y. + 20y. 7m. + 21y. 9m. = 80y. 8m.$, or 81 years. Hence, the early Christians placed the accession of the eighteenth dynasty eighty-one years before the Biblical date of the exodus, or in 1748 B.C.

23. Plausible as this hypothesis is in some respects, there is probably no Egyptologist of the present day that could accept it. To say nothing of the monumental evidence connected with the early kings of the eighteenth dynasty (which, however, present very great difficulties), there are two parts of this hypothetic scheme which are plainly repugnant to the Biblical narrative. In the time of Joseph every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians: this could not have been the case when the Hyk-shô's kings were on the throne. And again, the fourth reign of those which make up the eighty-one years is that of a queen, whereas the Biblical narrative states expressly that the exodus was at the end of the reign of a king. The Biblical narrative would obviously be better satisfied by supposing the persecutors of the Israelites to be of the Hyk-shô's dynasty, and the patron of Joseph to be of the Egyptian dynasty which preceded them; when the Shôsu, or shepherds, were known as troublesome neighbours, but were not yet known as conquerors and oppressors of Egypt. Neither of the two modes of making the exodus to synchronize with events in Egyptian history which were current among the early Christians was a proper mode. It is fortunate, however, that both were in use, and that the existing lists were falsified, one of them in order to produce one synchronism, and another to produce the other; as this circumstance is a great assistance in restoring the genuine reading.

24. But, whatever be the defects of the two hypothetic schemes which I have mentioned, I cannot help saying that either of them is, in my judgment, far less objectionable than the modern scheme which has been devised as a mode of reconciling them. The inventor of it,—I will not mention his name, because I am not sure of it, and I have not the works within reach which would enable me to ascertain it, and also because I suspect it to be one to whom Egyptology is under very great

obligations,—the inventor of it, whoever he was, set out with supposing that, instead of the two hypotheses starting from the one date of the exodus, 1667 B.C., and placing the accession of Ahmô's, one of them in that year, and the other eighty-one years before it, they started from the accession of Ahmô's, and supposed two—not exoduses, but—expulsions of the Hyk-shô's, one of them at that time, and the other, eighty-one years after, at the beginning of the fifth reign in the dynasty. Ahmô's, according to this hypothesis, drove the Hyk-shô's out of the rest of Egypt, and shut them up in Avaris, and Thothmô's, the fifth king of the dynasty, drove them out of Avaris. One writer after another has repeated this statement, as if it were an unquestionable truth, although the only ancient authority adduced in support of it was manifestly misunderstood. To me, who never accepted this hypothesis, and to whom it was always a puzzle how any one else could believe it, the pertinacity with which it has been adhered to appears most unaccountable. Bunsen in his latest work, the fourth volume of his *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, and Lepsius in his *Königsbuch*, treat the existence of this interval between the partial and the complete expulsion of the shepherds as a settled point. Lepsius makes a seventeenth dynasty of it, to which he assigns ninety-three years. Now this appears to me absolutely inconsistent with the well-established fact that Thothmô's I., the third king of this dynasty, carried his arms into Mesopotamia. I cannot conceive it possible that he could have done this, if there were within the frontiers of Egypt, in the direction to which he had to march, a large fortified city in the hands of his enemies. And more than this, as De Rougé has long since pointed out, Ahmô's, the son of Abna, is made to say on his funeral stèle that in the sixth year of king Ahmô's he took part in the capture of Avaris; after which he says that the king passed along the Nile, the whole length of Egypt from the north to the south (*Stèle Égyptienne*, p. 119). The idea of the shepherds having remained in Egypt till the reign of Thothmô's III. is, in one word, a pure fiction of modern Egyptologists, for which there is no foundation either in the writings of the extractors from Manetho, or in the hieroglyphic records.

25. Having thus cleared the way, I will proceed to consider the three lists as handed down to us by Georgius Syncellus, confining myself to the portions which begin with the eighteenth dynasty and end with the twenty-sixth. I here give the duration of each dynasty according to the three authorities, and the interval from the accession of Ahmô's to the beginning of each dynasty after the eighteenth.

	Africanus.		Old Chronicle.		Eusebius.	
Eighteenth dynasty	263	263	348	348	348	348
Nineteenth „	209	472	194	542	194	542
Twentieth „	135	607	228	770	178	720
Twenty-first „	130	737	121	891	130	850
Twenty-second „	120	857	48	939	49	899
Twenty-third „	89	946	19	958	44	943
Twenty-fourth „	6	952	44	1002	44	987
Twenty-fifth „	40	992	44	1046	44	1031
Twenty-sixth „	150	1142	177	1223	167	1198

It will be observed that the interval between the expulsion of the Hyk-shôs and the conquest of Egypt is exactly eighty-one years more according to the Old Chronicle than according to Africanus, the latter going back to the exodus, and the Old Chronicle to a period eighty-one years before it. Take 1142 for 1667 B.C., or 1223 from 1748 B.C., and there remains 525 B.C. for the date of the conquest of Egypt.

26. Before going further, it is necessary to consider the summation at the end of the twenty-fourth dynasty which is given by the Syncellus in the list which he ascribes to Africanus. No one, I believe, pointed out the meaning of this number until I did so in my paper of 1861, already cited. I observed that if we substituted 44 for 6 as the duration of the twenty-fourth dynasty, which number 44 is found both in Eusebius and in the Old Chronicle, we should have 990 in place of 952 for the sum of the dynasties beginning with the eighteenth and ending with the twenty-fourth. This number left standing alone, and with nothing to explain it in the list where it stood, is therefore Egyptian, and I doubt not Manetho's own (can. ii. of § 14). It follows from this that the number 6 in Africanus's list was 44 in A; that one of the numbers in the list of the Old Chronicle is too great by twelve, and one of those in that of Eusebius is too small by three.

27. I have hitherto said nothing as to the synchronism, to effect which the list of Eusebius was corrupted from C. It did not depend on the exodus. Eusebius places this at the end of one of the reigns in the latter part of the eighteenth dynasty, and does not seem to have connected any other Egyptian event with it. He placed it honestly where, according to his Biblical views, it ought to be placed, making no alteration in Egyptian chronology with a view to establish a synchronism. If we look, however, to the end of the nineteenth dynasty, we shall see his synchronism. He says that Troy was taken in the last year of this dynasty. Take 542 from 1198, and there remains 656, the interval, according to Eusebius, between the fall of Troy and 525 B.C., the conquest of Egypt. Eusebius's date of the taking of Troy is 1181 B.C., *three* years later than that of Eratosthenes;

and it cannot be doubted that Eusebius struck off the three years mentioned in the last section, in order to reduce the received date, with which C was in harmony, to his own. Let us now consider from which dynasty he struck off these years. Certainly not from the eighteenth, nineteenth, nor twenty-fourth, in which his numbers are the same as those in the Old Chronicle; nor yet from the twenty-first, where he agrees with Africanus. There remain the twentieth, twenty-second, and twenty-third; but if we look to the twenty-second, as it stands in Africanus's list, we shall see that the forty-nine years assigned to this dynasty by Eusebius are Egyptian. Africanus divides the dynasty thus:

α'	Σεσώγχις	ἔτη	KA'
β'	Ὀσορθών	ἔτη	IE'
γ' δ' ϵ'	Ἄλλοι τρεῖς	ἔτη	KE'
ς'	Τακέλωθις	ἔτη	IF'
ζ' η' θ'	Ἄλλοι τρεῖς	ἔτη	MB'

It is evident that, when the compiler of C thought it necessary to diminish the length of this dynasty, he felt himself obliged to stop at forty-nine, the sum of the three single reigns which are given; viz., $21 + 15 + 13$. We may be sure, therefore, that these three numbers are Egyptian. We cannot substitute fifty-two for forty-nine in C; nor yet can we admit any such correction as $K\Delta'$ for KA' or $I\Theta'$ for IE' , which have been proposed. If a correction of any number be required to make the sum accurate, we must read $K\Theta'$ for KE' . But it is an unsafe assumption that changes of the text were accidental, having been occasioned by similarity of letters; in the great majority of instances they were deliberately made, with a view to improve the text which the writer knew that he had before him.

28. It appears from what has been said that the three years struck off from C by Eusebius, were struck off either from the twentieth or from the twenty-third dynasty. We must suppose either that C had 181 for the length of the twentieth, or that it had 47 for that of the twenty-third. It will occur to most persons that the latter supposition is the more probable of the two, as it alters one of the three forty-fours which appear in the list of Eusebius as the number of years in these successive dynasties. It seems, at first, very improbable that this should be the case; and yet, if Eusebius obtained the number 44 accidentally by taking three from 47, neither of which last numbers was chosen in order to produce the 44, it does not appear to me that the improbability of the concurrence of three forty-fours is such as to have much weight. It appears to me a much stronger argument in favour of making this change rather

than the other, that 228, the length of the twentieth dynasty in the Old Chronicle, is probably a corruption of 178, the length according to Eusebius; and that the corruption having been made to avoid an anachronism, a displacement of the round number fifty years is vastly more probable than one of forty-seven. At any rate, as the two arguments tend to the same conclusion, I think we may safely infer that the change was made in the twenty-third dynasty, where C had 47 for the 44 of Eusebius. It will corroborate this conclusion if we find that to read 178 in the Old Chronicle as the length of the twentieth dynasty would produce an anachronism, according to a natural mode of connecting the reign of Rehoboam with Egyptian history, and that the substitution of 228 for it would remove the anachronism. Before, however, I consider the numbers in the Old Chronicle, I have something more to say of Eusebius.

29. It is not to be supposed possible that so laborious a chronologist as he was, and who had made so many changes as we know he did in the chronology previously received, as respected both sacred and profane history, should have made no change in the list of the Egyptian dynasties, other than to substitute 44 for 47 as the length of one of them. I by no means affirm this. I say that this was the only difference between the list given by the Syncellus as that of Eusebius, and the list that I call C,—the only change made by Eusebius from a non-Egyptian source; but I believe that the list C was constructed by Eusebius himself out of the two Egyptian documents A and B, which he had before him: and it will be found very useful in settling points that might otherwise be dubious in these two lists. We may assume that there is nothing in C which is not derived from A or B; and as a first-fruit of this principle we may conclude that 167, the duration of the twenty-sixth dynasty in C, must have been that of B also; for it is impossible that it could come from A. The person who diminished the durations of the later dynasties in order to bring down the exodus to 1667 B.C., and who struck off 38 years from the twenty-fourth, and manifestly 4 from the twenty-fifth (rejecting the units in the 44 found in the other two lists), must have rejected a unit in the twenty-sixth also. The duration must have been $150 + X$, X being less than ten, and could not therefore have produced 167.

30. The framer of the list in the Old Chronicle then added 22 years to the duration of the dynasties in B, in order to raise the accession of the eighteenth dynasty to 1748 B.C., i.e., 81 years before the exodus; and he effected this by adding 10 years to the twenty-sixth, and 12 to some of those before the twenty-fourth. The duration of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth

were 44 in all the Egyptian copies, as well as in the Old Chronicle and Eusebius. Now why did he divide these 22 years and add them in two places? Evidently to throw the accession of the twenty-fourth, or Ethiopian dynasty, sufficiently far back to maintain the proper Biblical synchronism. Hezekiah began to reign, according to the early Christians, in 736 B.C. (§ 16), and the first Ethiopian king had his aid sought by Hoshea before this. Now, according to B, the twenty-sixth dynasty began, as we have just seen, 167 years before Cambyzes, that is, before 525 B.C. (§ 25), or in 692 B.C. The Ethiopian dynasty began 44 years earlier, or in 736 B.C., which as we have just seen is too late. Accordingly the compiler of the chronicle added ten years to the twenty-sixth dynasty, throwing back the accession of the twenty-fourth to 746 B.C., which produces the required synchronism.

31. We see from this that the compiler of the Old Chronicle did not look to the Exodus alone, as what required a synchronism in Egyptian chronology. He made a change in order to make the period of the Ethiopian dynasty synchronize with the reigns of Hoshea and Hezekiah; and this being the case we cannot doubt but that he would make the close of the reign of Solomon and the fourth year of Rehoboam to stand in what he would consider their proper place in Egyptian chronology. We now know perfectly well that the Shishak who then reigned in Egypt was the first king of the twenty-second dynasty; but to the compiler of the Old Chronicle such a supposition could not occur. According to the Old Chronicle the twenty-second and twenty-third dynasties together only lasted 67 years, and there is a doubt whether the twelve years which the compiler of the Chronicle added were not added to one of these dynasties. On the most favourable supposition, the twenty-second dynasty, which began according to the Old Chronicle in 847 B.C., would not begin before 837 B.C. in B; and it very probably would not begin till 825 B.C. The fifth year of Rehoboam fell according to the early Christians in 986 B.C.: so that the synchronism now known to be the proper one was one that he could not conceive possible. His idea evidently was that the year 994 must fall within the twentieth dynasty, where the kings were not named, and not in the twenty-first, where all the kings were named, and where it was clear that none could be identified with Shishak. Let us suppose that the twentieth dynasty lasted according to B 178 years; the eighteenth beginning in 1726 B.C., the nineteenth in 1378 B.C., and the twentieth in 1184 B.C.; the twenty-first would begin according to B in 1006 B.C., and according to the Old Chronicle in 1028 B.C. This is 42 years before the fifth year of

Rehoboam, which, according to the notions of the compiler of the Chronicle, was the limit which the twentieth dynasty must include. Therefore, he added 50 years to the twentieth dynasty, and subtracted the same number from one of the subsequent ones.

32. It is still uncertain what were the durations of the twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third dynasties, according to B; but we now know that the sum of the three was not $121 + 48 + 19 = 188$ as in the Old Chronicle, but $188 + 50 - 12 = 226$. We have

	B		C	
Eighteenth	348	348	348	348
Nineteenth	194	542	194	542
Twentieth	178	720	178	720
Twenty-first	(121? 48? 19?)	?	130	850
Twenty-second		?	49	899
Twenty-third		946	47	946
Twenty-fourth	44	990	44	990
Twenty-fifth	44	1034	44	1034
Twenty-sixth	167	1201	167	1201

The lists B and C only differ in the duration which they assign to the twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third dynasties; and it is evident that as to these they do differ materially. No addition of 50 years to a dynasty of the Old Chronicle and subtraction of twelve from the same or another can bring them into harmony. Here then the list C must have been taken from A; and I will now proceed to recover as far as possible this last list, which may again, when recovered, assist us in recovering the deficient numbers in B.

33. The list given in § 25 as that of Africanus cannot be really his; for the list, as given by the Syncellus, contains a statement that the exodus took place at the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty; and we know that Africanus placed the exodus 130 years earlier than the accession of the eighteenth dynasty is here placed. When we recollect, however, that Josephus, who agrees with Africanus in respect to the synchronism of the exodus, says expressly and repeatedly that the eighteenth dynasty lasted 393 years, I think we cannot reasonably doubt that 263 was substituted for 393, which Africanus had in his list, by some corrector of Africanus, who disapproved of his lengthened chronology. It is certain, however, that the early Christians placed the exodus in 1667 B.C., and that this was, consequently, the date of the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, after they had cut down the three last dynasties from $44 + 44 + 150 + X$ to $6 + 40 + 150$. Somewhere, therefore, after the eighteenth dynasty Africanus must have added 130 years; and let us now consider where.

34. In the first place, there can be no doubt that the duration of the nineteenth dynasty, which is divided into the several reigns, has been enormously magnified by Africanus. He makes the reigns of four kings, in four successive generations from father to son, to reign 191, or rather, if we correct a clerical error, 196 years, which is out of all bounds of probability. Here then Africanus has added something considerable. Sixty years, which would leave 136 years for the four reigns, cannot be thought too much to take from the 209, which he joins to the dynasty; and that this was the true number that he added is rendered almost certain from the comparison of $393 + 149$ with $348 + 194$. Each sum is 542. It is very possible that the eighteenth dynasty was divided by Manetho into two portions, the latter of which lasted 45 years; and that while some of Manetho's followers, including the author of A, connected this period with the eighteenth dynasty, others, as the author of B, connected it with the nineteenth. We shall see hereafter that there is direct evidence that such a division of the eighteenth dynasty was made, and that the latter portion of it lasted 45 years.

35. There remain seventy years, which Africanus must have added to some dynasty between the nineteenth and the twenty-fourth. This could not be the twenty-first, because Eusebius, whose authorities were A and B, agrees with Africanus as to the duration of this being 130 years. It must, therefore, be either the twentieth, the twenty-second, or the twenty-third. In favour of the first supposition there are two probabilities. Africanus would be likely to make his additions to two adjacent dynasties; and the addition was more likely to have been made in the twentieth dynasty, where the reigns are not divided, than in either of the others, where the reigns are divided, and are already below the average, and in one of the dynasties greatly below it. It may occur to a person that by taking 70 years from 89, the length of the twenty-third dynasty in Africanus, we get 19, its length according to the Old Chronicle; but this number 19 is a very doubtful one, being one of three among which there exists two errors (§ 32). And the division of Africanus's duration of the entire dynasty 89 into the four separate reigns $40 + 8 + 10 + 31$ (ΔA for $\Delta \Delta$) seems to me to have strong internal evidence of its genuineness. But what seems to me to settle the question is this. Suppose that 65 was the reading of the early Christians and of A in this place, it accounts for the numbers in C. Eusebius in compiling this list had before him A and B. The four dynasties as to which there is now a doubt would, on the last supposition, stand thus in A, B, and C; all of which agree as to their entire duration being 404.

	A	B	C
Twentieth	65	178	178
Twenty-first	130		130
Twenty-second	120	226	49
Twenty-third	89		47

Eusebius seems to have preferred B's duration of the twentieth dynasty, and to have taken A's durations as the more likely to be correct for the three following ones. He retained A's number for the twenty-first dynasty, and he had then to subtract from the two following the 113 which he had added to A's duration of the twentieth. He took from the twenty-second so many as reduced the entire duration according to A to 49, the number in the three reigns expressed separately (see § 27); that is, he took 71 from this dynasty, and the remaining 42 he took from the twenty-third, reducing its duration from 89 to 47.

36. I now proceed to compare the lists A and B. Both of these are imperfect; the duration of the twenty-sixth dynasty being wanting in the former, so far as respects the units, by which it exceeded 150, and the durations of the twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third being uncertain in the latter. We only know that they were the three numbers, 121, 48, and 19, one of them increased by 50, and one of them diminished by 12, the third being unaltered; or possibly, though not probably, one of them being increased by 38, and the other two unaltered. I will now assume what cannot be considered absolutely certain, but what has a great deal of plausibility about it. It is not the only hypothesis that is admissible; but I find that it gives the duration of the eighteenth dynasty according to Manetho, when all corruptions have been weeded away, such as can be divided into separate reigns in a more satisfactory manner than the other hypothesis does. It will be observed that, according to B, the accession of the twentieth dynasty synchronizes with the fall of Troy, according to Eratosthenes. According to A, it was at least eight years later; for 159 is the greatest length that we can assign to the twenty-sixth dynasty. I assume that it was nine years later; that the number 121 is according to B the duration of the twenty-first dynasty, and that it was increased in A to 130, with a view to throw back the accession of the twentieth dynasty to 1184 B.C. The two lists A and B would then stand as follows, as proved, and on the hypothesis just assumed.

	A (as proved)		(as assumed)	B (as proved)		(as assumed)	(as assumed)
Eighteenth	393	393		348	348	348	348
Nineteenth	149	542		194	542	194	542
Twentieth	65	607		178	720	178	720

	A (as proved)		(as assumed)	B (as proved)		(as assumed)	
Twenty-first	130	737	}	226	946	121	841
Twenty-second	120	857				105	946
Twenty-third	89	946				44	990
Twenty-fourth	44	990		44	990	44	990
Twenty-fifth	44	1034		44	1034	44	1034
Twenty-sixth	150 + X	1184 + X	158	1192	167	1201	167 1201

37. Now, assuming what I have here assumed, it is easy to trace back these lists to two earlier lists, which may be called D and E. The latter will be obtained by merely reducing the duration of the twenty-sixth dynasty from 167 to 158. The former will be obtained by substituting 74 + 121 for 65 + 130, as the duration of the twentieth and twenty-first combined. A corruptor first added nine years to the 121, in order to bring the accession of the twentieth dynasty to 1184 B.C.; and then, observing that the sum of the seven dynasties had become 999 in place of 990, some other corruptor struck the nine years in excess from the twentieth dynasty. We have thus

	D			E		
Eighteenth	393	393	1717	348	348	1717
Nineteenth	149	542	1324	194	542	1349
Twentieth	74	616	1175	178	720	1175
Twenty-first	121	737	1101	121	841	997
Twenty-second	120	857	980	48?	?	876
Twenty-third	89	946	860	19?	946	?
Twenty-fourth	44	990	771	44	990	771
Twenty-fifth	44	1034	727	44	1034	727
Twenty-sixth	158	1192	683	158	1192	683

I add a third column under each letter giving the year B.C. when the dynasty began.

38. There is still a material difference between the two lists; but it will be possible to produce an earlier list F from which both these lists were derived, and a still earlier one, Manetho's own, of which this is a corruption. The lists D and E differ, it will be perceived, only as to three dynasties, the twentieth, twenty-second, and twenty-third; and the differences are of such a nature as can only be explained by supposing that two of these dynasties overlapped the following ones, so as to have two durations;—that each list gives the longer duration of one of the dynasties, that is, the time from its commencement to its extinction, and the shorter duration of the other, that is, the time from its commencement to the commencement of the following one;—and that the third of the dynasties, manifestly the twenty-second, was shortened by the difference between the longer and the shorter duration of that dynasty of which the full length was given. To give the correct chronology the shorter duration ought to have been given in both instances, and it is

so in F; but the framers of D and E each gave one dynasty its full length, and to maintain the total 990, they had to shorten the twenty-second dynasty.

The two durations of the twentieth dynasty are both given, 74 and 178; where, therefore, 178 is allowed for the twentieth, as in E, the twenty-second is diminished by 104. Let the shorter duration of the twenty-third be called Y, the longer is 89; and in D, where we have 89, the twenty-second dynasty is shortened by $82 - Y$; its length is $209 - Y$. Of course its length in E is $105 - Y$; and the list F must have been as follows:—

Eighteenth	348	348	1717
Additional	45	393	1369
Nineteenth	149	542	1324
Twentieth	$74 + 104$	616	1175
Twenty-first	121	737	1101
Twenty-second ..	$209 - Y$	$946 - Y$	980
Twenty-third	$Y + (89 - Y)$	946	$771 + Y$
Twenty-fourth ..	44	990	771
Twenty-fifth	44	1034	727
Twenty-sixth	158	1192	683

39. The second column in this table gives the interval from Ahmô's to the accession of the following dynasty, according to the view of the composer of the list F; but if we wished to have the sum of the durations of all the dynasties, we must add to the total in this list $104 + 89 - Y = 193 - Y$; and the mistake of the composer of this list F, which affected all the other lists that we have been considering, was that he supposed 990 to be the interval between the accession of the eighteenth and the twenty-third dynasty, when it was really the sum of the duration of the seven dynasties. Manetho's duration of the eighteenth dynasty was $193 - Y$ years less than 348 or $155 + Y$. His durations of all the subsequent ones were the same. In order then to have the list as originally constructed by Manetho, we have only to determine Y the length of the twenty-third dynasty in E. The twenty-second and twenty-third dynasties are in the Old Chronicle made to have lasted 48 and 19 years; and we have seen that 50 years were deducted and 12 years added, so that the sum of the two was 105. It is far more likely that the two changes mentioned were made in different dynasties, than that a single deduction of 38 was made from one of them. In this more probable case, Y would be 69 or 7; on the less probable supposition it might be 19 or 57, but no other value is admissible. Now, the twenty-third dynasty began by the table $771 + Y$ B.C., and it lasted 89 years, or to $682 + Y$ B.C. The last king of the dynasty was, according to Manetho, Zet, who is evidently the Sethos of Herodotus, who reigned at and after the time of Sennacherib's disastrous invasion. Now, it is quite certain from

the Assyrian inscriptions that Sennacherib's first or successful invasion was in 701 B.C., which would be the first year of the successor of Zet, if Y were 19. As Zet reigned beyond a later invasion, this is impossible; and consequently no other value of Y is admissible than 7. This gives for the accession of the dynasty 778 B.C., and accords with the statement of Manetho, following the name of the first king, ἐφ' οὗ ὀλυμπιάς ἤχθη πρώτη. This remark, though it would have been true if the dynasty had commenced in 790 B.C., would not have been likely to be made. Its appositeness arises from the accession of Petubastes being almost immediately followed by the celebration of the first Olympiad. If Y were 69, or were 57, it is manifest that the remark would not be true at all.

40. We are now in a position to see the object of the division of the eighteenth dynasty. Manetho stated that it lasted 162 years to the death of Amenophis, and 45 years afterwards. Lepsius and others admit that the duration of the eighteenth dynasty after the death of Amenophis was 45 years; and there was good reason for distinguishing this unhappy period of civil war, inflamed by religious fanaticism, during which the foreign conquests of Egypt were lost, from the prosperous and glorious period which preceded this event. It is remarkable too, that the lists of Josephus and Eusebius, which were composed after 186 years had been added to the duration of this dynasty, carried it down to a king whom they called Amenophis, namely, Menephthah, the son of Ramuss II. They made the period, which according to Manetho's genuine list extended to the death of Amenhotep III., extend to the death of Menephthah.

41. The original list of Manetho was therefore as follows. I give the durations, and the first and last years of each dynasty in years of the new kingdom, and in years before Christ.

		YEARS OF AHMÔS.	YEARS B.C.
Eighteenth dynasty to the death of Amenophis	162	1—162	1531—1370
Later reigns thereof	45	163—207	1369—1325
Nineteenth dynasty	149	208—356	1324—1176
Twentieth dynasty	74 or 178	357—534	1175— 998
Twenty-first dynasty	121	431—551	1101— 981
Twenty-second dynasty	202	552—753	980— 779
Twenty-third dynasty	7 or 89	754—842	778— 690
Twenty-fourth dynasty	44	761—804	771— 728
Sum of the dynasties	990		
Twenty-fifth dynasty	44	805—848	727 — 684
Twenty-sixth dynasty	158	849—1006	683 — 526

In the recovery of this list, no use whatever has been made of any monumental evidence. It is obtained exclusively from the numbers transmitted to us by the Syncellus, as those which

he found in the Old Chronicle and in the works of Africanus and Eusebius. And in the mode of procedure by which this original list has been recovered, there is scarcely anything which is at all arbitrary. The only doubts that can be entertained are whether 158, rather than 157 or 159, was the duration assigned to the twenty-sixth dynasty, and whether 121 or 130 was that of the twenty-first. The effect of supposing it to be 130 might be to bring down the date of the accession of Ahmô's nine years; for in that case, in order to maintain the summation of 990, we must subtract nine years either from the twenty-second dynasty, which would bring down the date of Shishonk's accession to 971 B.C., leaving the earlier and later dates as they stand; or from the twentieth, which would require that 65 be substituted for 74 as the interval between the accessions of the twentieth and twenty-first, which change again would require that $113 + 82 = 195$ years be subtracted from 348, in place of 186, and would thus bring down the accession of the eighteenth dynasty by nine years. The monumental eclipse of the twenty-second dynasty appears to me to furnish conclusive evidence in favour of the date 980 B.C.; and the consideration of Manetho's lengths of the several reigns has led me to prefer the earlier to the later date of the accession of Ahmô's, and therefore to prefer 121 to 130. Besides, I have given a plausible reason for corrupting the former of these numbers into the latter, and I can see no reason for a change in the opposite direction.

42. Assuming then that these doubtful points, which very slightly affect the result of my criticism, have been correctly decided, I proceed to test the correctness of my restoration by monumental evidence. There are three points to be specially considered, *viz.*, the Ethiopian synchronisms with Biblical history, the monumental eclipse of the twenty-second dynasty, and the Sothic date of Thothmô's III. I will consider these in the order in which I have named them, and first:—My position respecting the portion of Manetho's list which relates to the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth dynasties is, that while it is chronologically true, it is for a period of 41 years historically false. He omitted to distinguish the government of Tirhakah as ruler of Ethiopia from his reign as king of Egypt; and he introduced into his list the names of three kings at the head of the twenty-sixth dynasty, who were not kings of Egypt in any sense.

43. To make this matter plain, I will give a detailed chronology of the period which intervened between the close of the twenty-second dynasty and the accession of Psamitik I., distinguishing by brackets those portions in which Manetho deviated from the truth:—

B.C.	DYN. XXIII.	DYN. XXIV.
778	Petubastes..... 40	
	First Olympiad.	
771	_____	Bocchoris, 44.
788	Osorkon..... 8	
730	Psamût..... 10	DYN. XXV.
727	_____	Sabakon, the Ethiopian, conquered Egypt
720	Zet..... 31	and burned to death Bocchoris, 12.
715	_____	Sebikos, 12.
703	_____	Tarakos came with an army out of Ethi-
		opia and slew Sebikos, [20].
690	Last year of Zet.	
		DYN. XXVI.
		[683 Stephinates..... 7
		676 Nechapsos 6
		670 Nekao..... 8]
		662 Psamitik I.

Chronologically there is no error here, because the interval between Tahraka's overthrow of the first Ethiopian dynasty and the accession of Psamitik I. is correctly given as 41 years, but *historically* there is a great error. When Tahraka overthrew Shebetok, he did not succeed him as king of Egypt, but contented himself with the crown of Ethiopia, which he assumed, restoring Zet, or Seti III., to the throne from which his ancestor had been expelled by Bocchoris, during whose reign, and the reigns of Shebek and Shebetok, they were confined to the marshes of the Delta. Probably his reason for adopting this course was that an oracle had limited the rule of the Ethiopian kings over Egypt to fifty years, and that twenty-four of these had already expired when he obtained the Ethiopian kingdom. Accordingly he allowed Seti to reign to his death, on which event he assumed the double crown of Egypt; his first year as king being fourteen years after his conquest of Shebetok, or 689 B.C. He reigned twenty-six years, completing the fifty allowed by the oracle, and then withdrew to Ethiopia. One year of dodecarchy or interregnum intervened, and then Psametik assumed the royal title; but some years probably elapsed before he was generally recognized. As respects actual sovereignty, therefore, as recognized in Memphis, the succession stood thus:—

778	B.C.	Petubastes.
771	„	Bocchoris, who drove Petubastes to the marshes, and was himself taken prisoner and burned by
727	„	Shebek the Ethiopian.
715	„	Shebetok his son.
703	„	Zet restored by Tahraka, an Ethiopian chief, who slew Shebetok. He would, however, reckon his regnal years from the death of his father, calling that which was really his first his eighteenth.
689	„	Tahraka, king of Ethiopia, becomes king on the death of Zet.
663	„	Interregnum, Tahraka having retired to Ethiopia.
662	„	Psamitik I.

Here everything is consistent with the Second Book of

Kings, and with the cuneiform inscriptions. The embassy of Hoshea to So (Shebek) falls in his second year, and the invasions of Sennacherib, the first of which was in 701 B.C., find a king of Egypt, "a bruised reed," weak and unable to protect himself, and a king of Ethiopia his powerful protector. This king, the cotemporary of Sennacherib, is called by Herodotus Sethos, evidently the same name as Zet, and as Seti, a well-known name in the nineteenth dynasty.

44. Thus far I believe to be certain; and to disprove it would be to overthrow my arrangement of the chronology. I am now going to state what I believe to be true, but what I do not consider quite so certain, and what may be disproved without affecting the truth of my arrangement. I believe that this Seti III. is the king whose titles are given in the *Königsbuch*, No. 618, from a stèle in the Louvre (C 100) where he is commemorated along with his daughter Mûtiritis (No. 620). So far as I can judge from the description given by others, the former part of the king's name is obliterated precisely in the same manner as the first element in the name of Seti I. and II. The defacement was not intended as a dishonour to the king but to the god, and was probably in every instance where it occurs the work of the Persians. Lepsius identifies this Mûtiritis with a princess of that name, who became the wife of a man named Petamon, and from whom one of the wives of Ahmô's the Saite was descended in the fourth generation. This accords well enough with his view as to the name of her father being Pankhi, and as to the time when he lived. It does not, however, agree with my view; as it is scarcely probable that only six generations intervened between Seti III., who became king in 720 B.C., and Psamitik III., son of Ahmô's, who became king in 525 B.C. It is my belief that Lepsius confounds two princesses, of whom one was the granddaughter of the other. Mûtiritis, of the stèle in the Louvre, daughter of Seti III., I suppose to have married Kashto, who may have received the title of king in the lifetime of his father-in-law, and been the second of the "kings of Egypt" mentioned by Sennacherib as existing at the time of his invasion. Their daughter Amuniritis was the wife of Pankhi, who was an Ethiopian, perhaps the son of Tahraka; and this couple had two daughters, Shapenap, wife of Psamitik I., and Mûtiritis, wife of Petamun, whose son and grandson were both born in the reign of, and called after, their maternal uncle by marriage. The great-granddaughter of the one sister, and the granddaughter of the grandson of the other, were both married to Ahmô's, who thus acquired a title, in their right, to the throne which he usurped.

45. Although genealogies do not furnish evidence of dates that can be depended on for accuracy, they often afford good approximations. It so happens that in connexion with the royal pedigrees of this period, there are two personages, the dates of whose births are determined within a year, or at most two years, by the evidence of their names; and from these we may, by allowing twenty-five years to a generation (see § 3), approximate to the reigns of others who are genealogically connected with them. The two persons whose births are thus known were king Apries and his half-sister, the wife of Ahmô's, whose coffin is in the British Museum. The former must have been born in the reign of his great-grandfather, Psamitik I., whose throne-name was given to him as his family name; and he could not have been born long before its close, because his grandfather made a campaign the year after his accession, which it cannot be supposed that a very old man would do. If we say 610 B.C., we cannot be above two years astray in the time of his birth. His half-sister was born, as her name indicates, during the reign of Psamitik II., which only lasted five years. Placing her birth in the middle of the reign in 591 B.C., we cannot be above two years astray. We have thus approximately the dates of the births of the Saitic kings, and of the descendants of the elder dynasty, as follows:—

K. Psamitik I.	b. c. 685	B.C. lived to c. 76.
K. Nekau	b. c. 660	„ lived to c. 67.
K. Psamitik II....	b. c. 635	„ lived to c. 47.
K. Wah-het-Phrâ..	b. c. 610	„ dethroned c. 41.

Seti III.	b. c. 741	B.C. lived to c. 52.	
Mûtiritis	b. c. 716	m. K. Kashto.	
Amuniritis	b. c. 691	m. K. Pankhi.	
Shapenap.....	b. c. 666	m. K. Psamitik I.	Mûtiritis m. Petamun.
Nitokrit, sen.	b. c. 641	m. K. Nekau	Wah-het-Phrâ.
Nitokrit, jun.	b. c. 616	m. K. Psamitik II.	Psamitik.
Ankh-nes-nofer-het-Phrâ..	b. c. 591	m. K. Ahmô's	Petenit.
	b. c. 566		Tentkheta m. K. Ahmô's.
			K. Psamitik III.

The birth of Psamitik was, probably, considerably less than twenty-five years after 566 B.C. We may be sure that Ahmô's would marry his mother as soon as she had attained a sufficient age; and Psamitik had children when Egypt was conquered in 525 B.C. (Herod., iii., 14), who must have been five or six years old at least. We can readily suppose that the descendants of Mûtiritis were some years older than those of Shapenap, on the same line with them.

The above pedigrees are fully established from Kashto downwards. The point in which I differ from Lepsius, De Rougé,

and others, is, that they consider the king with the partly defaced name, mentioned with his daughter on the Louvre stèle, c. 110, to be Pankhi, the son-in-law of Kashto, while I consider him to be Seti III., his father-in-law.

46. The genealogy and chronology, as I have given them, are evidently in perfect harmony; and this harmony will continue if we trace back the twenty-third dynasty; Psammus being born c. 766 B.C., Osorkon, c. 791, and Petubastes, c. 816. This last would thus be about twenty-eight years of age when he came to the throne, and would have lived till he was seventy-eight. I see no reason to doubt that he was the son of Shishonk IV., the last king of the twenty-second dynasty. Here, and in several other instances, I conceive that Manetho made a new dynasty, when there was a change of the dimensions of the kingdom, though there was no change in the reigning family. Petubastes was driven out of the capitals and the principal part of Egypt by Bocchoris, and could not, therefore, be regarded as continuing the prosperous twenty-second dynasty, which held the whole kingdom. Perhaps he had the misfortune to be blind, and that this fact contributed to the success of the usurpation. At any rate, I think there can be little doubt that his retreat to the marshes of the Delta, and the subsequent restoration of his great-grandson on the overthrow of Shebetok, were the facts which, distorted and embellished by the informants of Herodotus, were the basis of his fabulous history of Anysis (ii., 137, 140). Herodotus represents Anysis himself as restored, and Sethos as his successor; but in reality, his Sethos was the restored prince, and was the third in descent from the exiled one.

47. I will now proceed to consider the eclipse which is recorded in an inscription of a king Takelut, of the twenty-second dynasty, to have taken place on the 24th Mesore, in the fifteenth year of his father. This eclipse seems to have been first noticed by Brugsch. I am not aware that any Egyptologist has disputed his interpretation of the passage, but its importance as settling the chronology of the period has not been generally recognized. This record of an eclipse has been ignored or pooh-poohed by almost all who have had occasion to notice it; and for this I can assign no other reason than that its having happened according to the inscription is inconsistent with all the chronological systems that are current among Egyptologists. The following propositions are indisputable:—

1. On the 24th Mesore of the Egyptian civil year which began 17th April, 946 B.C., that is, on the 4th April, 945 B.C., the moon was totally eclipsed.

2. On no other 24th Mesore than this, could the recorded eclipse have taken place.

3. Takelut I. was son of Osorkon I., who was son of Shishonk I., the founder of the dynasty, who, according to Africanus and Eusebius, reigned twenty-one years.

From the first and second of these propositions, it follows that, if the record be *true*, the eclipse must have been that of the 4th April, 945 B.C. No other eclipse can be put forward, except on the hypothesis, that the sculptor of the inscription was careless, and wrote the 24th Mesore by mistake for some other date.

48. This hypothesis has been put forward by Mr. Basil H. Cooper, in the *Athenæum*; he would read the 28th Mesore, on which day in the year which began 24th March, 852 B.C., namely, on the 16th March, 851 B.C., there was an eclipse of the moon visible in Egypt. Mr. Cooper felt himself constrained to make this correction of the Egyptian text, through his dependence on Lepsius's arrangement of the kings in the twenty-second dynasty, according to which the Takelut who recorded this eclipse was Takelut II. Of the correctness of that arrangement, however, Lepsius offers no positive proof. Mr. Cooper ought to have recollected his own arguments against the *correction*—rather the *corruption*—of the date of the rising of Sothis, in the inscription of Thothmôs III. at Elephantine, which Lepsius and Bunsen had advocated. It is to me utterly inconceivable, that in the record of any event of which the date is given, the writer of the inscription should put down the date incorrectly. The case of the error committed by the sculptor of the Rosetta stone in respect to the month in which the king came to the throne, is by no means a parallel case. The Rosetta stone was one of many hundred copies of a decree which would only be in force during the life of the king, in whose honour it was made. The general fate of these copies would be, that after the king's death they would be thrown aside as useless, if they could not have the inscriptions cut away so that they might receive new ones. The natural consequence of this would be, that the execution of these stèles would be committed to inferior workmen, and that those employed would be careless as to mistakes. If one of them saw that he had put down a wrong word, he would not take the trouble to correct it. On the other hand, the Karnak inscription which we are now considering was the single record of what it commemorated; the account of what had occurred was inscribed on the walls of the temple *in perpetuum rei memoriam*; and if there had been a mistake in the date, it would have been immediately observed and corrected. I

should observe also that the mistaken date on the Rosetta stone is not in the decree itself, but in a recital, and that it relates to a point in the recital which is absolutely *immaterial*; whereas, when a date is given in a historical inscription, it is probably the most material information in it. Mr. Cooper saw clearly the absurdity of supposing that the sculptor of the inscription at Elephantine had given a false date, and he ought not to have admitted so readily as he does that there was a false date in the inscription of Takelut at Karnak.

49. Unless, therefore, there can be positive proof produced that the eclipse of the 4th April, 945, *could not possibly* have been the eclipse of the inscription, I contend that we are bound in common honesty to admit that it was so; and that all presumptions to the contrary, drawn from doubtful hypotheses which are inconsistent with it, ought to fall down before this distinct record. I have already discussed this matter in § 10, to which I refer; and I now remark that there are three distinct pretended impossibilities,—in reality, inconsistencies with received theories, which are appealed to, as proving that this eclipse of 945 B.C. could not be that intended. First, it is alleged that this eclipse could not have been seen by the Egyptians. If the moon's acceleration be so great as the Astronomer Royal, Hansen, and others imagine, the moon must have been completely disengaged from the earth's shadow before she rose in Egypt. Secondly, it is alleged by Lepsius, and by Egyptologists generally after him, that the writer of this inscription was Takelut II., and not Takelut I., as I contend. If this were true, the date of 945 B.C. is, of course, inadmissible. Thirdly, it is alleged that the Biblical date of Rehoboam's accession, 975 B.C., is too early, and that Shishonk's accession, which preceded his, could not have taken place till the latter half of the tenth century before Christ. Now, the fifteenth year of Osorkon I., the father of Takelut I., must be thirty-five or thirty-six years after the accession of Shishonk; consequently, the eclipse could not have been in that regnal year of his, unless the accession of the twenty-second dynasty was in 980 B.C. or 981 B.C. My reasons for preferring the date 980 B.C. must be deferred till I come to consider the chronology of the separate reigns. Now, I deny that any one of these three alleged impossibilities is a real one. I contend that not one of the hypotheses, with which the supposition that the eclipse occurred as it is recorded that it did is inconsistent, is sufficiently established to cause us to reject a testimony like that of this inscription. I hold that the record ought to be received as it stands; and that, *consequently*, the co-efficient of the moon's acceleration must be diminished, so

as to admit of this eclipse having been seen by the Egyptians ; the Takelut of the inscription must have been the first king of that name ; and all the schemes that have been proposed for bringing down the building of the temple, or the accession of any of the kings of Judah below the dates given in the margin of the English Bible, must be rejected. The Astronomer Royal and his numerous followers, Lepsius and other Egyptologists, as well as Sir H. Rawlinson and Mr. Bosanquet, must all abandon their respective theories, which are inconsistent with a well-attested astronomical record. As to the two latter gentlemen, what I have said in § 10 will suffice ; but I have something to add in reply to the Astronomer Royal and Lepsius.

50. The supposition that the moon's acceleration has been greatly exaggerated by Hansen in his tables is by no means a new one, adopted by me in order to maintain the credit of this eclipse. I have held this opinion, and advocated it whenever I have had an opportunity, for the last six years and upwards. At the Manchester meeting of the British Association, I brought forward what appeared then, and still appears to me, to be conclusive evidence of this fact. I refer to pages 22—24 of the Report for 1861, where I refer to two lunar eclipses, recorded by Ptolemy as having taken place in 720 B.C., in both of which the eclipse is recorded to have taken place considerably after the time when it should have happened, according to Hansen's tables ; the interval between the calculated and the recorded time being, in one instance, a full hour. I stated in the paper that I did not wish the calculations to be taken on my authority ; I wished that others should make similar calculations. I am now enabled to state that such calculations have been made, and that those which I made have been found to be perfectly correct. The Astronomer Royal (whose paper read at the same meeting, entitled "Remarks on" mine, p. 12, is not a *reply* to mine, which the Astronomer Royal had not heard) referred me to a paper of Dr. Hartwig, in No. 1241 of the *Astronomische Nachrichten*, in which he gives a calculation from Hansen's tables of the different eclipses mentioned by Ptolemy. With respect to the eclipse of —719 March 8, he agrees with my calculation to a minute. He places the middle of the eclipse at 11*h.* 13*m.*, and the end at 12*h.* 7*m.* *mean* Babylonian time. The equation of time was then 14*m.*, which would give 10*h.* 59*m.*, and 11*h.* 53*m.* for the middle and end of the eclipse. Ptolemy's statement is, that the middle of the eclipse was ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ μεσονυκτίῳ, at the very instant of midnight, at that marked period when the sixth of the two-hour clepsydras had run out, and the seventh was set a-going ; the first of the clepsydras

having been set a-going at apparent noon. This is, in its nature, an observation on the accuracy of which very great dependence can be placed. It could not have been more than a few minutes astray, and it is evident that it was recognized both by Hipparchus and by Ptolemy as the very best observation that they had. It was that which they both compared with eclipses observed in their own times, in order to determine the mean motion of the moon. And yet Dr. Hartwig, when he should produce Ptolemy's statement of what was observed, for comparison with what he had calculated, says that the middle of this eclipse was, according to Ptolemy, "unbestimmt, um mitternacht,"—*undetermined, about midnight!* I question if a more reckless misstatement of adverse testimony was ever made by the advocate of a desperate cause. In reality, the time when the eclipse was stated to have been, and must have been within a mere trifle, *greatest*, was 6*m.*, according to Dr. Hartwig's own calculation after the eclipse ought, according to the tables, to have been greatest, and 7*m.* after it ought to have emerged from the shadow. Here we have, as I contend, *conclusive* evidence that the co-efficient of T^2 in the moon's mean elongation is *much* less than Hansen supposes. If the whole error were due to this cause, it would amount to $2''\cdot9$; but we may well suppose that there was a considerable error also in the place of the perigee, and this may have produced a change in the time of opposition, either in the same direction as the change caused by the error in the acceleration or in the opposite direction. In the former case, a less error than $2''\cdot9$ would suffice; in the latter, we must admit a greater error than this.

51. Having made these preliminary observations, I now proceed to speak of the eclipse of —944 April 4. The tables of Hansen do not extend beyond —800; but by the formulæ given in the preface, I have calculated the moon's place for this eclipse, and also that of the sun, on the supposition that the eccentricity was then $\cdot017915$, which is, I believe, what Hansen would make it to be. According to these data, the opposition of the sun and moon would take place on the 4th April —944 at 0*h.* 41*·8m.* G. M. T.; adding 2*h.* 5*m.* for difference of longitude, and subtracting 6*·5m.* for equation of time, the opposition would fall at 2*h.* 40*m.*, apparent time at Memphis, or about, as I calculate, 3*h.* 23*m.* before the moon would rise. The eclipse would continue 1*h.* 40*m.*, or thereabouts, after the opposition, so that it would be over, *according to Hansen*, 1*h.* 43*m.* before the moon rose. The question to be considered is—can we admit such an error in the tables, consistently with the record, as to the eclipse of 8th March —719, when the error was only 1*h.* 1*m.*? It must

certainly be acknowledged, that we cannot, if the mean longitude of the moon herself be the only thing in which the tables are at fault. In the eclipse of —719, an error of a second in the co-efficient of T^2 in the moon's mean longitude would produce an error of about 21*m.* 3*s.* in the time of opposition; while in that of —944, it would only produce an error of 22*m.* 57*s.*; so that 61*m.* in the former eclipse, which is the proved error of the tables, supposing the observation to be *accurate*, would correspond to an error of only 66·5*m.* in the latter. There may have been a slight error of observation in the eclipse of —719; the middle of the eclipse may not have been reached for some 5*m.* after apparent midnight; but about 72*m.* is the outside that can be allowed for the error in —944, corresponding to the observed error in —719. Let us suppose, however, that, as I suggested in § 50, there was an error in the place of the moon's perigee, which would retard the time of opposition by about 10*m.*, this would require that the error in the mean place of the moon, which is in the opposite direction, was greater than I have supposed. It will be convenient to assume the co-efficient of T^2 in the moon's mean elongation to be 8''·5. This supposes an error in the time of opposition of 77*m.* 43*s.*, which is about 11*m.* 43*s.* greater than the observation admits. Now, in the eclipse of —944, the error of 77*m.* 43*s.* would be increased to 84*m.* 44*s.*; while the error caused by the perigee would have its direction changed, the moon being in the opposite part of its orbit; and instead of being —11*m.* 43*s.*, would be + 11*m.* 7*s.*, so that an error of 96*m.* is admissible. The error of the tables should, however, as we have seen, be at least 103*m.*, supposing the observation to have been in the longitude of Memphis; but is it quite certain that it was so?

52. We know that Shishonk, the founder of the twenty-second dynasty, overran the kingdom of Judah; and we may naturally suppose that he retained some frontier fortress, which might serve as a point of support to the Egyptians in future wars. Any such fortress must be 14*m.* of time eastward of Memphis, and it might very well be 15*m.* The moon might have risen *there* 7 or 8*m.* before the termination of the eclipse; and for aught that we know to the contrary, the record may have referred to this point. Indeed, we have direct evidence that about the time of this eclipse, the king of Egypt was at the head of an army in Palestine. It is stated in 2 Chron. xiv. 9, that Zerah, the Ethiopian, who has been pretty generally identified by Egyptologists with Osorkon I., father of Takelut I., was defeated by king Asa at Marisha, about 15*m.* eastward of Memphis. In the following chapter, it is stated that after pur-

suing the invaders, and collecting an immense spoil, Asa effected a religious reformation, and gathered the people together at Jerusalem, in the third month of his fifteenth year. According to the canon of kings of Judah, as given in the Books of Kings, and as generally received by the early Christians (when corrected by eleven years, falsely inserted at the end of the canon to make up the seventy years' captivity, according to the misinterpreted prophecy), the first year of Asa was that which began in the spring of 959 B.C. (see § 16), and his fifteenth was that which began in the spring of 955 B.C., fifteen days after the eclipse. The assembly at Jerusalem was, in all probability, at the new moon, seventy-four days after the eclipse; and the interval between the battle and the assembly could not be much less, if at all less, than two months. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the eclipse happened when the king of Egypt was in Palestine, marching eastward, not many days before the battle; and if so, the eclipse must have been observed there. The record by no means implies that the eclipse was total. Possibly, it implies no more than that the moon was obscured, as it might be by the penumbra, just after it had emerged from the dark shadow; and if the moon rose, thus darkened, to the army in Palestine, it might appear worthy of notice, more especially when it was found that this phenomenon had not been seen in Egypt. Unfortunately, the text of the inscription at Karnak is in a very mutilated state, so that while the date and the record of the moon being obscured at that date are well preserved, the connexion in which this fact was recorded is wholly lost.

53. I now dismiss this discussion of the eclipse, which professed astronomers may take up if they like. I have considered it merely in a chronological point of view. I have, I think, shewn (as I sought to do) that there is no *absolute impossibility* in the eclipse of 4th April —944, having been observed as stated in the inscription of Takelut; its having been observed is not inconsistent with Ptolemy's record of the eclipse of 8th March —719, nor, I may add, with his record of that of 1 Sept. —719, nor with the record of the eclipse of Agathorles. All these records are consistent with the eclipse of —944, having been observed in Palestine. The only supposed records which I know to be inconsistent with it, are the pretended eclipse of Larissa and the eclipse of the Lydian war, if it were that of —585. Both of these records, however, I hold to be fanciful, and of no authority. The latter involves a decided anachronism. Now, there being no *absolute impossibility* in this eclipse having taken place as it is recorded that did, I contend that the record ought to be accepted as evidence that it did take place. It would in my

opinion be contrary to sound criticism to suppose that an obscuration of the moon, recorded to have been observed, did not really take place, or had some other cause than the earth's shadow.

54. I now come to the objection that is grounded on Lepsius's arrangement of the kings of the twenty-second dynasty. I admit that if, as Lepsius supposes, the Takelut under whose father the obscuration of the moon is said to have happened, were Takelut II., an eclipse could not have happened at the time indicated; but I maintain that Lepsius's arrangement is an arbitrary one, and is incorrect. In order that it may be seen in what respect my arrangement differs from his, I will give in the first place so much of the arrangement as I adopt.

First king.....	Shishonk I. (Ra-hut-h'eper, sote-p-en-Ra).
Second king, his son	Osorkon I. ?
Third king, his son	Takelut I. ?
Fourth king, his son	Osorkon II. ?
Fifth king	Shishonk II. (Ra-hut-h'eper, sote-p-en-Amun).
Sixth king	Takelut II. ?
Seventh king	Shishonk III. (Ra-t'usur-mâ, sote-p-en-Ra).
Eighth king.....	Pemai (Ra-t'usur-mâ, sote-p-en-Amun).
Ninth king, his son	Shishonk IV. (Ra-âa-h'eper).

Four kings are known by direct monumental evidence to be sons of their predecessors; Lepsius supposes that all were so; and I am disposed to agree with him. Twelve generations, averaging twenty-four years, would bring us from Shishonk I., born about 1029 B.C., down to Seti III., born about 741 B.C. The age of Shishonk I. at his accession may be estimated pretty closely. He was not too old to make a warlike expedition in his sixth year, and to reign for twenty-one years; and yet he was sufficiently old to have a son grown to man's estate, to whom he preferred giving the daughter of Psusennes in marriage, to marrying her himself. We cannot suppose him to have been much over or under fifty. Possibly he was somewhat older, as he had a son older than Osorkon, who died before his father.

55. Now, the question at issue between Lepsius and his followers and me relates to the throne name of the two Osorkons and the two Takeluts. There is a representation of a king accompanied by a prince, his son, at Karnak (Leps., *Auswahl*, 15), who is certainly the same Takelut in whose reign the inscription recording the eclipse is dated, because he has the same throne name Ra-hut-h'eper, sote-p-en-Ra. The question at issue is,—Was this Takelut I. or II.? The inscription speaks of the prince (who was dead, and apparently not long dead, when the inscription is dated, the eleventh year of Takelut, first of Tobi), as “first prophet of Amun (with other titles): Osorkon deceased,

born of the king's principal wife Karamama-merit-Mût (may she live!), daughter of the first prophet of Amun (with other titles) Namerut, royal son of Osorkon, son of Bast (may he live!)” Takelut himself is called son of Hisit: and in another inscription in the same plate of the *Auswahl*, that from the Nile statue in the British Museum, Osorkon I. is named without any such designation as son of a goddess. It is by the contents of these two inscriptions that the question is mainly to be decided. Lepsius and I each draw a conclusion which would settle the question at issue, if the premise which we respectively assume were true: but I deny the truth of his; and he would probably deny the truth of mine, which he does not notice. Other arguments only tend to shew that one hypothesis is more probable than the other; but these two lead to a certain conclusion. Of course, one at least of the premises adduced by Lepsius and me must be false.

56. Lepsius assumes that the addition to a family name of Sa-Hisit, Sa-Bast or Sa-Nit, *i.e.*, “son of Isis, Bast or Nith,” was made with a view to distinguish the king so designated from a previous king who bore the same family name. Granting this to be the case, the Takelut and Osorkon of this inscription must be respectively the second of their name: I meet this argument by denying the truth of the proposition assumed by Lepsius. He admits himself, that the title which he supposes to be distinctive is often omitted, and that the names of the two goddesses are indiscriminately used. All that he can rest on is, then, the supposed fact that this addition is never made to the first king with any family name. It is curious, however, that he has himself furnished evidence contradicting this assertion. In the *Königsbuch*, No. 576, he gives the family name of Takelut I., with the addition “son of Isis.” This is taken, I believe, from some leathern fragments at Berlin. Here, then, is an instance, given by himself, in which the two kings who alone bore the family name of Takelut are alike called “son of Isis” in their family name; the two different throne names accompanying the very same family name. Again, in the twenty-sixth dynasty, Ahmôs is always called son of Nît; and I can scarcely think that this was to distinguish him from a king who reigned about a thousand years before him. I also find the same addition to the name of Psamitik I. (Sharpe, *i.*, 114.) In this plate we have the funeral vases of a general named Wah-het-Phrâ em k’u (or em tiou-en-Ra, as it was formerly read), whose name implies, as I conceive, that he was born when the Pharaoh, or Sun-god, so distinguished, whom we know to have been Psamitik I., was setting in glory. Now, the father of this general, whose

funeral vases are in the Louvre, is called Psamitik-sa-nît; and it is a matter of necessity that it was Psamitik I., after whom he was called; and consequently that king must have borne this title. It may occur to some that the younger general was called after Apries, in which case the elder might have been called after Psamitik II.; but in the first place, the family name of a king (which Wah-het-Phrâ was of Apries), was never used in this connexion; and in the second place, the death of Apries was of such a nature that we cannot suppose it possible that a young courtier should give his name to his son, commemorating a dethroned and murdered king, as if he had died in honour after a prosperous reign. No name could have been more appropriate than this for one who was born in 609 B.C., and it would have been hard to select one less so for a person who was born about 569 B.C. Nor again is it at all likely that if a courtier at the last date should have been foolish enough to give his son this name, both he and his son would have been successively advanced by Ahmô's to the rank of general. From all that has been said, I feel fully convinced that the designation of a king as son of a goddess was purely honorary, and by no means intended to distinguish him from a previous king of the same family name.

57. The general principle which I assume is, that the addition of "May he live!" to a king's name implies that he is alive. If so, Osorkon, mentioned in this inscription, must be the father, and not the grandfather of Takelut; and, of course, the Takelut here named must be the first of the name. In order to disprove this it would be necessary to produce an instance in which this addition is made to the name of a deceased king; but I contend that, even if such an instance could be adduced, though this conclusion would not necessarily follow, it would be highly probable that it was true. The only instances in which I have *seen* this addition made to a king's name, where his being alive was doubtful, are a tablet of the reign of Amen-em-hê II., already referred to, where the fact of the king so qualified being alive appears to me certain; the present inscription, where it is not impossible, for Osorkon, had he lived, could not be above eighty years old at the outside; and the inscription on the Nile statue, where Psusennes, the last king of the twenty-first dynasty, whose daughter was married to Osorkon I., is thus qualified. This inscription may very well have been made in the third or fourth year of Osorkon I., the twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth of the twenty-second dynasty; and there is no improbability in Psusennes having survived his dethronement twenty-five years, if he had been allowed to die a natural death. I have

seen no other inscription where the phrase occurs, and where there is any ground for doubting that the king was alive. I have *read*, however, of one of the Apis stèles, in which, if the statement be correctly given, there is a clear instance of the addition being made to the name of a dead king. I allude to the stèle of the twenty-eighth year of Shishonk III., in which this addition is said to be made to the name of a king Osorkon, who, whether he be first or second, must have been long dead.

58. It is safest, under these circumstances, to consider what is *probable*, assuming for argument's sake that there is no such certainty to be had, as I have been speaking of. In the first place, we have some sort of evidence from the Apis tombs. Mariette gives as successive Apises those who died in the twenty-third of Osorkon II., the fourteenth of Takelut I., and the twenty-eighth of Shishonk III. According to Lepsius, his Takelut I. should be II., whereas, according to my views, his Osorkon II. should be I. According to this view, we must suppose that several Apises intervened between the second and third of the above three; while, according to Lepsius, only one could have done so. It seems improbable, however, that we should here have the complete series; and if there be a gap for one, it may have included several. According to Africanus, Takelut II. only reigned thirteen years; but as the duration of the dynasty was shortened from 202 to 120 years, it is likely enough that both the fifteen years of Osorkon and the thirteen of Takelut are too small. I suspect the true numbers were twenty-five and twenty-three. At any rate it is improbable that no Apis should have been buried in the reign of Shishonk III., till his twenty-eighth year. While, then, I admit that the Apis monuments render Lepsius's theory rather more probable than mine, I think that the probability in favour of mine, derived from the argument in the preceding §, very nearly, if not altogether, counterbalances this.

59. The question is then to be decided, as it appears to me, by fitting the several personages mentioned in the inscriptions as connected with the royal family into their places, in the outline already given, and seeing which can be made to fit there in best accordance with the known length of generations. I will give a list of the persons mentioned who have to be placed, with what I suppose to have been their parentages and the approximate times of their births and deaths, and the leading events of their lives. All the dates are B.C. I omit unimportant personages.

1. Shishonk I., b. about 1029, became king 980, took Jerusalem 975, d. 959.
2. Osorkon I., b. about 1005, married daughter of Psusennes in 980, by whom he had two sons, 3 and 5; became king 959; invaded Judæa in 945; reigned alone till 934 [may have lived 10 years or so longer, his son 7 being king.]

3. Namerut, first prophet of Amun, heir of the twenty-first dynasty through his mother; b.c. 979, died soon after his father's becoming king.
4. Karamama, daughter of 3, heiress of the twenty-first dynasty; b. about 959, and was married to her uncle, Takelut I., about 944.
5. Shishonk, born c. 977; became first prophet of Amun on the death of his brother; erected the Nile statue soon after; died before 934.
6. Osorkon (of the Denon papyrus), prophet of Amun, son of 5, born c. 955; died before 934, after his father, but before his grandfather. He was probably murdered.
7. Takelut I., son of 2 by Tamentah'onsu, as Lepsius reads her name, b. about 981; became first prophet of Amun on the death of 5, to the prejudice of the hereditary rights of 6; in 934 became king [alone, or in conjunction with his father]; reigned till 919 at least.
8. Osorkon, son of 7 and 4, born c. 943; was first prophet of Amun, but died in his father's life-time about 924.
9. Osorkon II., son of 7, and a wife, whose name ends in —pes;—the former part has not yet been read,—born c. 957.
10. Shishonk II., son of 9, born c. 933; d. c. 889 or 899.
11. Takelut II., son of 10, born c. 909; reigned c. 889 or 899; d. c. 876.
12. Shishonk III., son of 11, born c. 885; reigned c. 876. Apis died 849; he died c. 824.
13. Shishonk, son of 2, and Karamat, Sam of Phthah, chief priest at Memphis, born c. 970; presided at the burial of an Apis in 937.
14. Takelut, son of 13, was born c. 910, and succeeded his father in all his offices.
15. T'esbast-peru, daughter of 9, and Hisit-em-H'eb, born c. 925.
16. Pet-Hisit, son of 14 and 15, born c. 900, succeeded his father in all his offices. He presided at the burial of an Apis in 851, and was living twenty-six years after, when the next Apis was buried; he was then aged about 75, and had grandchildren grown up.

I need not treat of the descent of Har-pe-son, as it presents no difficulty. He assisted at the burial of an Apis in or about 779, being the sixth in descent from Osorkon II., who was born c. 957. We may suppose him to have been thirty-four years old, and we should have about twenty-four years on an average for a generation.

If any one can point out a flaw in the above arrangement, I will readily acknowledge my error; but at present it appears to me perfectly satisfactory, both as respects monumental evidence, and as respects the ordinary course of human life.

60. I must, however, beg my readers to recollect, that if this arrangement of the dynasty be shewn to be inconsistent with the monuments, or if the grounds on which I have maintained that it was possible for an eclipse to have been seen by the Egyptians in 945 should be proved to be untenable, my restoration of Manetho is not affected by it. I bring forward this eclipse as a confirmation of conclusions at which I have arrived, independently of it. I argue, that as it is almost certain that an eclipse is monumentally recorded to have happened on a specified day, we ought to admit the record to be true unless there be a *certainty*, arising either from astronomical data or from monumental evidence, that the eclipse which appears to be recorded *could not*

have taken place. *Probability* will not do, because the probability that the monumental record was true would outweigh almost any probability that could conflict with it. And be it remembered that if it be proved that the record was *untrue*, its error must be in the *fact* that an eclipse occurred at all; some atmospheric phenomenon may *possibly* (though, I think, *most improbably*) have been mistaken for it: it cannot be in the date; for it is quite certain that, whether what is recorded happened in 945 or not, it could not have happened in any other year. If my eclipse is a good record, my arrangement of the dynasties is verified in the most remarkable manner. If I fail, there is no monumental eclipse at all, and my arrangement is neither verified nor disproved.

61. It is otherwise with the third of the synchronism, which I proposed to consider,—that of the rising of Sothis on the 28th Eipti. It must have risen on that day in four successive years, and there could be no mistake in the observation of the fact. It is certain, too, that the record of the rising on this day belongs to the reign of Thothmô's III. Consequently,—unless we suppose that an Egyptian sculptor inscribed the stone through mistake with a false date; which it is inconceivable that he should do, the stone having been fixed up in a public place, where an error, if it existed, must have been at once observed, and would of course have been immediately corrected,—*consequently*, I say, Thothmô's III. *must* have reigned in the fifteenth century B.C., when only this phenomenon could have occurred. According to my chronology, he would have done so; but not according to Lepsius, Bunsen, and most other Egyptologists.

With this observation I will conclude what I have to say, as respects the dynasties; and unless my system, so far as I have yet exhibited it, shall be proved to be unsound in the interim, I will, D.V., give the dates of the commencement of most of the reigns in the July number of this Journal.

EDWARD HINCKS.

Killyleagh, 29th Nov., 1862.



THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

THAT the same object seen from various points of view should present to the observers aspects which, on comparison, are distinguished by great differences having a more or less obvious relation to one fixed type, is what we should expect. And this is precisely the result which *A History of the Interpretation of Scripture*^a would shew to have been produced upon the minds of those who have been employed in the examination of the contents of the Bible. Whatever may be the questions raised as to the origin of Scripture, no one denies that the book has been handed down in its integrity the same as it was at the first when the canon of Holy Scripture was complete. There is also the fact of the acceptance by the whole Christian church of the creeds which contain a definite cycle of truths which the Scriptures were appealed to as containing. But under this general consent there has of course ever been full scope for the workings of individual minds and the discussion of questions which have given rise to opposite schools of thought. It has been permitted that errors should from time to time arise and flourish in order to draw out the counter statement of truth, the assertion of which was called for by something in the circumstances of the age or of the Church. Such error, if vitally affecting any received truth included in the cycle of Christian doctrine, became heresy if persisted in against the instinctive sense of the Christian society and the countervailing testimony of Holy Writ. The disciples of apostles, and those who followed them, did not profess to teach in opposition to the early heretics anything which they had not themselves consciously received from the apostles who had exhorted them to adhere to what they had heard from the beginning. Whether or not there exists from the beginning a recognized summary of the substance of Christian doctrine, it will not be denied that the ultimate reception by the whole church of the Nicene and Athanasian statements on the Trinity and the Incarnation amounts to an assertion, so far as that reception reaches, of the essential identity of that teaching with what had been in the mind of apostles, and would have been asserted by them had occasion called for it. We ought, however, to supplement this remark by the consideration that the germs of all teaching claiming to be apostolical ought to be discoverable in their writings, and that what is asserted to be the true meaning of an article of faith ought to be provable out of Scripture; the degree to which this proof is accepted by the church affording the same kind of presumption

^a Jowett's Essay, pp. 338—341.

in its favour which the general acceptance of the canonical books affords in favour of the canon of Scripture.

Writing as we do from a conservative point of view, and in opposition to the tendencies of the destructive criticism which has been imported into our own country, it is only in a limited sense that we can admit that the "one meaning"^b of Holy Scripture has yet to be discovered, or what is equivalent to such a notion, that we are in a better position than the earlier generations of Christians have been for estimating the force and truth of the New Testament records more especially. To approach the Bible without prejudice is not the same thing as coming to it with a destructive theory of its origin, contrary to any which we know to have been held previously, or indeed to have been possible in an earlier age. It is unnecessary in order to place ourselves in imagination with the company of the believers who saw and heard our Lord and his apostles, that we should assume^c that the line of saints and doctors, whose views of the Gospel are on record, did not thus realize that objective truth which they join in supporting by their testimony. The main consideration here, as in every other subject of enquiry, is not how does it appear to the mind uninfluenced and unprejudiced by other associations, but what is the truth of the matter? what is the real object of faith? It is not necessary that the competency of the individual mind which ignores the intervening "history of Christendom" should be assumed in the determination of this question. Unless the promise of Christ has failed, the true object of faith can be nothing more or less than that which all Christians from the beginning have consciously or unconsciously held in common. Not of course that the foundation of faith may not seem to have varied according to the circumstances of the individual believer or his capability of appreciating the proof as it is presented to his own mind. But whether Romanist or Protestant, the spirit of the earnest enquirer who uses the means within his reach, tends to the attainment of the same result. We consider, however, that the atmosphere of English theology is eminently favorable to the correct interpretation of Scripture in its relation to the wants of the age, inasmuch as amongst ourselves there exist the conditions for combining the conservative principles of the old theological schools with the toleration of that amount of speculative enquiry which is needed for the conciliation of faith and science.

Any principles of interpretation are from the nature of the case inadmissible, which assume the analogy of any of the line of the sacred writings of the Old and New Testament to "any

^b Jowett's Essay, p. 378.

^c p. 338.

other book," such as Plato or Sophocles.^d Those who have instituted such a comparison are constrained to admit that it fails in various particulars.^e The fatal objection to it is that these particulars are of material and essential importance. For of what other writings can it be pretended that, in their scope and application, they reach from the beginning to the end of the world? that the very text of them has been protected and preserved with such jealous and watchful care; that they have been committed to the custody of the successive representatives of the bodies to which they belong, claiming to be the authorized witnesses and keepers of the same; that they have been appealed to, both by those who receive and those who reject the truths which they contain; and that they are the acknowledged source and fountain of a prevailing system of faith and worship? Surely the "absurdity" imputed to the difference of views respecting "the meaning of words," and the evidence of facts" in the Old and New Testament, belongs properly to the assumption that the Bible is to be "interpreted like any other book," if by "like" be meant from the same point of view and on the assumption of its human origin.^f The special inspiration predicated of the Bible, both from internal and external testimony, is a sufficient explanation of the peculiarities which distinguish it from other writings, and which are to be referred to the divine design. Let any analogous design, comprehending in its view the history and destinies of the whole human race,^g be pointed out in any other writings, and the opponents of conservative interpretation will then be in a better position for maintaining that there is no more evidence of design in the Bible than there is in any other book.^h

We cannot admit that between the age of the New Testament Scriptures and that in which the creeds were drawn up there is no link of connexion.ⁱ The absence of any such link can only be argued on suppositions which would impair the testimony of Christian witnesses to one special design of St. John's Gospel to meet the erroneous conceptions of heretics, and to rectify the application of philosophical terms. The creeds were a natural complement to the explicit teaching of the Apostles, and they proceed upon the supposition, that the same spirit, who by St. John the divine attested the objective truth of the gospel, was continued in the body of the Christian society, for the guidance of those who came after; regard being had to the inspired writings as the source from which the church's statements were to be drawn. In declaring her testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation, the church was, we conceive, only

^d Ibid., pp. 335, 336. ^e p. 337. ^f pp. 336, 337, 377. ^g p. 425. ^h p. 381. ⁱ p. 385.

continuing the apostolic testimony, by asserting what had been actually in the mind of the Apostles of Christ, and what their writings contain in germ. In fact the creeds are acknowledged to be a part of Christianity.^j How can this be on any other supposition than that which we have taken to be the explanation of their final acceptance by the church? Is it not the fact that the controversies which succeeded the apostolic age found in these their final solution?

Very limited, therefore, and external to the essentials of Christianity must be any principles of interpretation which can dispense in their application with the testimony of the creeds in the elucidation of the meaning of Holy Scripture. Much more reasonable, surely, is it to premise that it is from them that we are to draw (as thousands of simple believers have done) our conceptions of the living idea of the person of Christ, and of the nature of Christianity as it was imbibed by those who actually occupied that point of view which is now desiderated^k for the interpreter of the Christian Scriptures. The latter must otherwise depend upon the imagination, unassisted by any thing external to Holy Scripture, unless he betakes himself to the imaginative creations of a later age. The alternative of reducing the interpretation of the Bible to the discovery of "one meaning," which shall be a bond of union,^l in which Gentile, Hebrew, and Christian religion shall find its fulfilment, would only be consistent with discarding definite Christianity altogether, unless it be meant that the Incarnation, as foreshadowed and anticipated both in Gentile and Hebrew worship and prophecy, and as realized historically in the gospel, is indeed, as it is, the one idea in which all religion culminates.

Foremost among the questions which have been raised on the destructive side, is the significancy and meaning of words, and the import of the Old Testament prophecies.^m The bearing on this subject of the Greek of the New Testament will be taken into account afterwards; but prior to this consideration, is that arising from the fact that the Hebrew writers of the Old and New Testament were no exceptions to the rest of their nation in respect of the current notions of the Jews on this subject. The significancy attached to proper names, in particular, is one obvious reason for the prominence given to genealogies as historical records. The discrepancies in the two genealogies of Christ find their most natural solution in regard to this amongst other principles. And closely interwoven with, and allied to the same consideration, is the received typical and prophetic character of the leading persons of the Old Testament dispensa-

^j Ibid. p. 353.^k p. 343.^l pp. 378, 427.^m pp. 334, 367—369.

tion, who (as in the case of Joshua, David, and Jeremiah) acted out, or represented in their own persons, predictions which it was impossible for them to exhaust, but which had their culminating fulfilment in Jesus Christ. The language and form of the Messianic prophecies contain more than was realized in any person anterior to the Messiah. And if a reason be desiderated for the Jews having been led to associate such description with certain individuals, and with the state of the nation, it is to be found in the fact that hereby the expectation of the Coming One was sustained from age to age. Let any objector to the two-fold, or rather the manifold, sense of prophecy culminating in Jesus Christ, explain how the double design of sustaining the expectation of the Messiah, and, at the same time, securing the plenary fulfilment in Him of the prophecies (for instance, the xxii. Psalm and the liii. of Isaiah) could have been brought about in any other manner. Certainly "the rule of interpreting Scripture from itself" is decisive in its application to this subject. And it must be to little purpose that we have sat at the feet of Christ and His apostles, if we fail to discern in the revelation of Christianity something more than that "one meaning," common to all dispensations of religion, which proceeds upon the denial of what is peculiar to Christianity.

Among the essentials of interpretation^o which the destructive criticism seems to be directed to impair, is the received proof (as stated for instance by Bishop Pearson) of the proper deity of Jesus Christ, and the personality of the Holy Spirit. Even, however, if scholars were prepared to admit that the conservative argument on these cardinal points required revision, we apprehend that they could not but be agreed that it must be in the way of adaptation in respect of the form, and not of any essential alteration in the substance of the proof, just as, in the distinct department of evidences, the arguments of Butler and of Paley serve as a substantial basis for the refutation of new forms of objection to certain of the grounds of faith.

Another subject to which our attention is drawn on the side of the destructive criticism, is the conservative doctrine of marriage and divorce. This subject is encompassed with great practical difficulties, on account of the hindrances which exist to the exemplification, on any equal scale (in the same rank of society), of the purity and strictness of the Christian rule. Also the disproportion between the number of the sexes, and the neglect of domestic discipline regulating the laws of their intercourse (so far as the analogy of the Old Testament dispensation may be legitimately extended to limit the strictness of the

* Ibid., p. 382.

° pp. 358—361.

Christian rule), are among the causes which may have combined to the production of social evils, and the disregard of the remedial character of marriage. So far, however, as the doctrine of divorce is concerned the interpretation of Matt. v. 32 is clear. It was unnecessary that the words (ἐκτὸς λόγου πορνείας), "saving for the cause of fornication," should be repeated in the second clause, because they would have been superfluous. Matrimony in the teaching of Christ is as indelible as holy orders are in the idea of the Church. The bond might be annulled by divorce; but, on the reconciliation of the parties, no iteration of matrimony is allowable. How does this consist with the recognition of the re-marriage of the divorced parties?

Under the head of "episcopacy," which is also referred to as an illustration on the side of the destructive criticism, the main points on the conservative side are the principle of ministerial succession, both as respects the Levitical and Christian ministry, and the necessary derivation from none other than "the Great Apostle and High Priest of our profession;" of those who were sent as He was sent by the Father, with a view to the continuation of their ministry "always even unto the end of the world." These propositions are at least self-consistent and intelligible. Nor do we see any flaw in that explanation of the threefold ministerial succession, which, whilst it limits the term apostle to those personally sent by Christ, follows the Septuagint in extending to their office, so far as it could be inherited, the permanent application of the word bishopric. The filling up of the bishopric of Judas, the presidency of James as bishop in the Jerusalem synod, and the powers given to Timothy and Titus, go to shew that such a succession was in prospect; whilst the fact that the succession was universally continued under the line of bishops supplies the counterpart, which is from the nature of the case needed to complete the conservative proof. If the doctrine of "infant baptism" stands on a less irrefragable basis of proof by inference from Holy Scripture, it is a difference of degree rather than of kind; the practice of the Church supplying in this, as in the former case, the key to a sound deduction from the Scriptures. Nor is that in any sense a far-fetched interpretation of Holy Writ, which has led Christians to agree to such an extent as they have done to discern in the alliance of sovereign powers with the Christian Church, a fulfilment of the predictions respecting the relation to her of kings and queens as nursing parents; an office and relation analogous to that which the good successors of David held with respect to the ministry of the priests and Levites, notwithstanding that the latter were instituted anterior to the rise of the kingdom.

It cannot be said that such questions as these are materially

affected by the state of the Greek language,^p and the decaying form in which it subsisted when adopted by the Hebrew writers of the New Testament. The circumstances were rather such as to favour the transfer, to such words as grace, faith, righteousness, sanctification, on the one hand, and to such words as form, fulness, substance, on the other, of that depth and pregnancy of meaning which they have retained in theology, and which alone can answer to the mystery of the incarnation. The Greek language in its decay was, as Professor Jowett has pointed out, adapted to the reception of those germinal ideas and thoughts which impart a character of its own to the language of the New Testament viewed in relation to the Septuagint, and the influence of that version upon the Jewish and Christian churches.

It is only in the prospect of the possible bearing of discoveries in the field of physical science on the interpretation of the Bible, that the destructive criticism^q can for any time expect to sustain itself in the atmosphere of English theology. Even in this connexion, however, the alleged retreat of our expositions on the first chapter of Genesis before the results of geology, is somewhat premature on the testimony of geologists themselves. Nor can the argument against the recorded miracles of revelation be maintained on any other ground than that of alleged antecedent incredibility, arising from our ignorance of the laws to which they are to be referred, beyond what we know generally of the power and wisdom of God. If, under these circumstances, a destructive theory of the four gospels^r be desiderated as a necessary preliminary to agreement in the interpretation of them, then why, we ask, is not the same consideration extended to the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles? In the opening of his *Horæ Paulinæ*, Paley gives to his reader the liberty to suppose that these writings, the Pauline Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, had "been lately discovered in the library of the Escorial, and to have come to our hands destitute of any extrinsic or collateral evidence whatever;" and yet every reader must be constrained to admit the conclusion in which the argument results, that "the persons and transactions were real, the letters authentic, and the narration in the main true." Such is the conclusion drawn even in the case desiderated by Mr. Jowett^s for an interpreter of Scripture, as respects the historical character of the Acts of the Apostles, which presupposes, be it observed, the truth of the Gospel history. It may be added that the same consideration is of weight against the objections to the miraculous

^p Ibid., pp. 389, 390, 393, 394.

^q pp. 341, cf. 348, 349; and what is said of "miraculous causes," p. 426.

^r pp. 370, 371.

origin of Christianity, which is inextricably intertwined with the details of the narration whose truth is otherwise vindicated.

That the language of Scripture should be capable as it is of being applied and accommodated¹ not only by the well-instructed preacher but by the ignorant peasant, and that it should appeal to the heart rather than the understanding is, we conceive, one indication of that manifold design which the fact of its inspiration explains. In the Bible are gathered up and concentrated "the words of the wise and their dark sayings," of which, perhaps, the parables and discourses of our Lord, and the enigmatical language of the Apocalypse, furnish the highest illustration. Admitting that to a certain extent prophetic interpretations destroy each other," there is notwithstanding even in this department a residuum of truth to be arrived at by an induction from universally received and accredited principles. Nor ought it to be supposed that any light granted to individuals can, unless illusory in its character, lead them to conclusions at variance with universally received principles of interpretation and of criticism.

In concluding these remarks on the conservative side of the interpretation and criticism of the Scriptures, we may add that there is an obvious reason why certain questions of doctrine, once agitated, are incapable of being revived, viz., that the argument on both sides has been exhausted, so that the particular doctrine has either taken its place among the received truths of religion, or as peculiar to the Catholic schools of theology." On the other hand, there is ample room for the discussion of questions which have not yet assumed so fixed a character in connexion with the toleration of opposite schools of thought in the same communion.

C. GOOCH.

¹ "It is better to close the Book, than to read it under conditions of thought which are imposed from without," *ibid.*, p. 343.

² pp. 404—406, 408—429.

³ p. 341.

⁴ Mr. Jowett seems to assume (p. 366) that predestinarian views are peculiar to the school of Calvin, whereas the most rigid and absolute doctrine of predestination to life was peculiar to the Catholic schools of Augustine and Aquinas; and it is the addition of the dogma of the inamissibility of saving grace, which distinguishes Calvinism. The assumed connexion of the words "neither the Son" (Mark xiii. 32) with the "Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity" proceeds upon a previous assumption (*cf. ibid.*, p. 354), that the necessary limitation of human knowledge implied in that passage was not included in the *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε* of Phil. ii. 6, 7; whatever may be thought of the asserted non-identity of the terms employed in this passage with the equivalent statements "equal to," or "of one substance with the Father." As regards the objections to the logical method of interpretation, we apprehend that nothing is lost to "truth," by "clearness" in stating even "erroneous explanations" (*ibid.*, p. 377), because whatsoever doth make manifest is light.

NOTES ON BISHOP COLENSO'S NEW BOOK.

I. THE GENEALOGY OF GEN. XLVI.

It seems that the earliest portion of the Holy Scriptures, the Pentateuch, must pass in this country through a new ordeal. Hitherto English criticism has on the whole recoiled from the dogmatism with which some eminent continental scholars have dissected the writings traditionally ascribed to Moses, and revered as his; and weary of the objections that had been continually raised against their authenticity, has been content to pass by those objections with comparative neglect. But in the prospect of the wide circulation which the position of the writer is likely to obtain for Bishop Colenso's critical examination of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, it becomes the more important that those who have the means of so doing should carefully and honestly weigh the force of the arguments brought by him against their historical credibility. It is as a contribution towards a critical estimate of their cogency that the present paper is intended.

A broad line separates the first of Bishop Colenso's objections from the rest. By the latter he seeks to overthrow the credibility of that which is commonly regarded as a contemporary account of the events of the Exodus. By the former he seeks to destroy our confidence in that which Moses himself could only have recorded on the testimony of earlier authorities. As it is the only direct impeachment which Bishop Colenso brings against the historical credibility of the Book of Genesis, it must be supposed that he attaches considerable importance to it. To it we shall now then direct our attention.

The charge may, in substance, be thus stated. Among the persons who went down with Jacob into Egypt are mentioned two grandchildren of Judah, Hezron and Hamul, the sons of one of the children whom he had by his widowed daughter-in-law Tamar. From the peculiarity of relationship in which Judah stood to them, it is evident that, although actually their grandfather, he must have been somewhat more than old enough to be their great-grandfather; yet at the time of the descent into Egypt he was only forty-two years of age.

This charge rests on the assumption that we have in Gen. xlv. 8—27 a catalogue of the persons who, having been born in Canaan, actually travelled down to Egypt along with Jacob. No doubt, so far as words go, this is what it professes to be. And the care with which the number of names is summed up at the close makes it difficult to suppose at first sight that it can be

other than this. Yet a closer inspection will lead us to hesitate before we trust too much to outward appearances.

In Numb. xxvi. we have a detailed account of the families into which the several tribes of Israel were parted. This document must, in respect of the matter before us, be regarded as of the highest importance. Unlike the list in Gen. xlv., or the genealogies in the books of Chronicles, it purports to be the record of a census carried out under the superintendence, if the Pentateuch be the work of Moses, of the contemporary author by whom the record has been transmitted to us. It constitutes therefore our highest and most accurate authority for the names of the ancestors from whom the Israelites, after they had grown into a nation, counted themselves to be descended.

Now in this account we find as a general rule (the exceptions shall be treated of presently) the same names, and none other, with those which meet us in the list of Gen. xlv. If the sons of Jacob had any other children than those who are mentioned in Gen. xlv., we must suppose that they either left no descendants, or failed to transmit their names as the heads of the families of the posterity whom they left. Yet from the time of life at which the twelve patriarchs descended into Egypt it is probable that many of them would have children subsequently to their settlement in that country; and no reason can be easily assigned why such children should not themselves have become the heads of subsequent families. We find moreover that the four persons mentioned as grandchildren of the patriarchs in Gen. xlv.—two of Judah, and two of Asher,—all appear as the heads of houses in Numb. xxvi., and enjoy an exceptional position among the grandchildren of the patriarchs in this respect. Yet it is not probable that the accidental circumstance of a child's having been born in Canaan rather than Egypt should cause him to be reckoned as the head of a separate family, when in general the families of Israel were named after the ancestors of the older generation. We can readily understand that various causes may in the process of time have given rise to a greater distinction between the subordinate families in some cases than in others, and thus that those who were, genealogically, but separate branches of the same stock may have been eventually reckoned as separate stocks; but it is in the highest degree unlikely that this should have depended (unless it were by some special providential ordering) on the eventuality of the ancestor's having come into the world a few months earlier, or a few months later, than the date of his parents' journey into Egypt.

If this reasoning be sound, and if our premises be on the whole correct, we are evidently led to view the list in Gen. xlv.

as a list not of those who actually traversed, whether on foot or in their mothers' arms, the wilderness from Canaan to Egypt, but of those whose names were transmitted to their posterity of the date of the Exodus as the heads of Israelitish houses, and who may thus be reckoned the early ancestors of the Israelitish people. And this is in fact the view which has generally been taken by those who have investigated the subject.

There are, as we have already hinted, exceptions to the accordance between the names in Numb. xxvi. and Gen. xlv. A separate examination of them in detail will shew that they do not invalidate the conclusion which we have drawn.

There are, in the first place (that we may not leave aught untouched), differences in orthography between the corresponding names of the two lists. The Nemuel of Numb. xxvi. 12 appears in Gen. xlv. 10 as Jemuel. Similarly for Pua, Jashub, Zephon, Ozni, etc., we have in Genesis Phuvah, Job, Ziphion, Ezbon, etc. The differences, which are in Hebrew not so great as they appear in English, are evidently due in the main to error, perhaps very early error, of transcription. Such differences might indicate the independence of the two documents: they can hardly indicate aught beside.

There are, in the second place, certain grandchildren of Jacob mentioned in Gen. xlv. who do not appear at all in Numb. xxvi. Excluding Er and Onan, who perished in Canaan, and certain members of the family of Benjamin, of whom shortly, they consist of Ohad son of Simeon, and Ishuah son of Asher. As to Ishuah, one would be disposed to suspect, from an examination of the Hebrew text, that the name might be an interpolation, arising from the error of a transcriber, whose eye, after he had copied three letters of the following name Isui (Heb., Ishui), reverted to the final letter of the preceding Jimnah. The genealogy in 1 Chron. vii. 30 furnishes no obstacle to this supposition, inasmuch as it was probably copied from that in Genesis: on the other hand, the numerical computation of the family of Zilpah in ver. 18 may be deemed to tell against it. Ohad, though we fail to trace him in the Book of Numbers, recurs in the fragmentary list of Exod. vi., and apparently as the ancestor of an Israelitish family. But how far from unlikely that his descendants might have become extinct, or have merged into other families, between the date of the exodus and that of the census in the plains of Moab; the more especially when we take into account the vast numbers of Israelites who perished by plague in the wilderness as a punishment for their sins! What if the "chief house among the Simeonites" whereof the guilty Zimri was prince (Numb. xxv. 14), were this house of Ohad? What

if this explain the decrease of the Simeonites from 59,300 at Sinai to 22,200 in the later roll?

Thirdly, in the case of the descendants of Levi and Joseph, we have mention in Numb. xxvi. of families sprung from ancestors of a lower generation than those whose names appear in Gen. xlv. In this there is nothing to surprise us. The exceptional position enjoyed by Ephraim and Manasseh as the heads not of families but of tribes, naturally elevated their immediate children to the dignity of heads of families; and that they should be mentioned as such in one record, and not in another, is only what, under the exceptional circumstances, we might fairly expect. As for Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, the three sons of Levi, although they did not, like Ephraim and Manasseh, become the heads of separate tribes, still the three branches of Levites descended from them were so definitely and permanently distinguished that there would be fair room for doubt whether the subordinate divisions of each branch ought not to be reckoned as attaining to the dignity of chief houses. Again therefore we find nought tending to disprove the view that we have taken of the character of the catalogue of Gen. xlv.

We come, fourthly, to the difficulties presented by the accounts of the family of Benjamin. In Gen. xlv. 21, ten sons are, apparently, assigned to him; a circumstance which should, of itself, make us hesitate before we allowed the list in that chapter to be a list of those who personally descended into Egypt. Bishop Colenso suggests that they may have been the sons of different wives. But it is, it must be confessed, improbable that, even so, Benjamin, the youngest of Jacob's children, should have had, at the time of the descent, a larger family than any of his brothers. There are no indications elsewhere in the Pentateuch that Benjamin was to be, or was, more prolific than the other patriarchs. Besides which the whole narrative conveys the impression that he was truly "a little one," as he is in fact described to be (Gen. xlv. 20), when Jacob and his sons moved from Canaan. In direct opposition to Bishop Colenso we maintain that he was most probably not born at the time that Joseph was sold. We never read, as Bishop Colenso seems to imagine, of Joseph "remembering" his brother tenderly: his love for him was love for one whom he had never before beheld. Gen. xxxvii. 3, 4, seems to imply that Joseph was the youngest son so long as he remained in Canaan; in Gen. xxxvii. 10, we have mention of Joseph's mother, apparently as still living, though she died at Benjamin's birth; and in Gen. xlviii. 7, Jacob seems to relate to Joseph the story of his mother's death as a thing which he had not personally

known. If so, the utmost age of Benjamin at the time of the migration would be twenty-two years; and he might have been considerably less. Independently of this, we can hardly imagine that Jacob could have exercised the restraint over his movements which he seems to have exercised in not suffering him to go with his brothers to buy corn, had he been at the time the father of a numerous family. We must therefore gird ourselves to the task of grappling with the difficulty over which Bishop Colenso has so lightly passed; and we shall here find a very serious break in the chain of legitimate assumptions which are necessary to the consistency of his argument.

The account of Benjamin's family in Gen. xlv. 21 runs thus: "And the sons of Benjamin were Belah, and Becher, and Ashbel, Gera, and Naaman, Ehi, and Rosh, Muppim, and Huppim, and Ard." That the first three of these were sons of Benjamin is confirmed by a comparison of other lists. Bela (בלע, everywhere: our English Version violates its usual rules of English orthography when, in Genesis, it writes Belah) appears as such in Numb. xxvi., in 1 Chron. vii. 6, and in 1 Chron. viii. 1. Becher, though not mentioned in the census of Benjamites in Numb. xxvi., appears in 1 Chron. vii. 6; and also in 1 Chron. viii. 1, if we there by an easy emendation of the text, consisting in the movement of a letter from one word to another, read for "Bela his firstborn, Ashbel," "Bela, Becher, and Ashbel" (אֲדָרְלֵעַ בְּכֹרִי אֲשֶׁבֶל for אֲדָרְלֵעַ בְּנֵי וְאֲשֶׁבֶל).^a Ashbel comes before us in Numb. xxvi., and is declared to be the son of Benjamin in the last-cited passage, 1 Chron. viii. 1. Probably also he is identical with the Jediael of 1 Chron. vii. 6: if the etymologies given for Ashbel and Jediael by Gesenius be correct, a name signifying "opinion of God" might easily pass into one denoting "known by God," or possibly, "knowledge of God;" the latter would be the name adopted in testimony of thankfulness for blessings received. Thus far then our way has been clear before us. But Naaman and Ard, whose names come respectively fifth and tenth in Gen. xlv. 21, are stated in Numb. xxvi. 40 to have been sons of Bela; they were therefore grandsons, not sons, of Benjamin. Both are mentioned in company with others as sons of Bela in 1 Chron. viii. 3, 4, if Ard and Addar be the same (אֲדָר, אֲדָר): the letters *r* and *d* strongly resemble each other both in old and square Hebrew, and may therefore have been easily interchanged. It would appear moreover from this passage that Gera was also a son of Bela: we

^a It will of course be necessary in this case to reject the subsequent words, "the second," "the third," etc., from 1 Chron. viii. 1, 2.

find no trace of his name in Numb. xxvi. As for Ehi, עִי, he is commonly identified with the Ahiham of Numb. xxvi. 38, who is himself, without much doubt, the same with the Aharah of 1 Chron. viii. 1.^b But the word may also be treated as a common noun, the construct form of עֵם, "brother;" and we shall presently see that this may suit well with the context. To the name Rosh we have no parallel in any other record of the descendants of Benjamin. It seems therefore probable that the letters of רֹשׁ should be divided. The first three letters, by the easy alteration of ר into ר', become the name Gera, repeated; and this throws light upon the repetition of that name in 1 Chron. viii. 5, after its occurrence in 1 Chron. viii. 3. In both its recurrences it may be viewed as governed by the preceding עֵם, "brother of," still extant, as we have just found, in Gen. xlvi. 21, and concealed in 1 Chron. viii. in the supposed name Ahoah, אֹהַי, of ver. 4. As for the last letter of the imaginary Rosh, it may be annexed to the following Muppim, which will thus, as Shemuppim or Shumpim, approach nearer the Shuphan of Numb. xxvi. 39, to the Shuppim of 1 Chron. vii. 12, and to the Shephuphan of 1 Chron. viii. 5. For that it is the same pair of persons that are continually mentioned together, whether as Muppim and Huppim, or as Shupham and Hupham, or as Shuppim and Huppim, or as Shephuphan and Hupham, will hardly be disputed. They were, as we see by Numb. xxvi., the ancestors of two principal families of the Benjamites. Whether they were themselves immediate sons of Benjamin, or in what relation they stood to him, we can hardly tell. In 1 Chron. vii. 12, they seem to be called the children of Ir; but the latter part of that verse probably relates to the posterity not of Benjamin but of Dan; and if the accounts of the two tribes have, through mischance, been amalgamated together, it is difficult to say at what precise point that of the one ends and that of the other begins.

The record of Benjamin's family will now, as amended, stand as follows: "And the sons of Benjamin, Bela, and Becher, and Ashbel, Gera, and Naaman brother of Gera, Shemuppim, and Huppim, and Ard." We thus have but eight names instead of ten; and, among these eight, three at least not children but grandchildren of Benjamin. There is still indeed a difficulty in the absence from this list of Ahiham, who is so distinctly mentioned in Numb. xxvi. 35: it is possible that his name may have

^b The letters מ and נ at the end of words interchange elsewhere, from whatever cause, with נ: thus Shimeah (1 Chron. viii. 32) and Shimeam (ix. 38), Abijah and Abijam, Siloah and Siloam.

dropped out by reason of its initial resemblance to the word *ימ*. But we may now clearly bid farewell to the hypothesis of a family of ten children by different wives having been born, or having been supposed to have been born, to Benjamin in Canaan; and with it we may fairly abandon also the view that the catalogue of Gen. xlv. was intended to be an exact catalogue of those who personally journeyed from Canaan to Egypt; for no one surely, not even a compiler of a fictitious narrative, would have assigned grandchildren to Benjamin "the little one" at the date of that migration. The conclusion then at which we originally arrived, and which critical investigators have generally adopted, must still be viewed as correct, viz., that we have in Gen. xlv. a list of the ancestors, without regard to the date of their birth, from whom the Israelitish families were severally descended.

As to the actual statement in the catalogue that these were the persons "which came into Egypt," it will, however strongly expressed, not appear unnatural when we reflect that the descent into Egypt formed a new starting-point in the history of Jacob's posterity. It is not, of course, literally accurate; but we have a close parallel to it, which Bishop Colenso has not really succeeded in setting aside, in another statement contained in this catalogue itself. The account of Jacob's posterity by Leah concludes, in ver. 15, thus: "These be the sons of Leah, which she bare unto Jacob in Padan-aram, with his daughter Dinah: all the souls of his sons and his daughters were thirty and three." As the numerical computation implies that the reference is to the whole of the posterity previously enumerated, we should have to conclude, if we took the words literally, that the whole had been born in Padan-aram. This plainly was not the case. The sojourn in Padan-aram, where most of Jacob's own children were born, comes here simply into view as a previous starting-point in the history of his family.

As to the exact numerical computations of the catalogue, on which Bishop Colenso relies, it is doubtful how far they can be justly presumed to have proceeded from the author of the document. They will apparently be vitiated if such names as Ishuah and Rosh have no real existence. Even the circumstance that, as the catalogue stands, Jacob himself should have to be numbered with his posterity by Leah in order that the number thirty-three in ver. 15 may be accepted as exact, may fairly excite some degree of suspicion. And thus the probability suggests itself that these computations, whereby the sum of the people in the list is brought up to the exact number seventy, may be due not to the original compiler of the record, but to some subsequent transcriber of it. We shall only be following

the example of the earliest extant interpretation of the sacred text in viewing the computations contained in it with less scrupulous reverence than we attach to the record generally. The Greek translators, in their version of this catalogue, give the whole number of souls not at seventy, but at seventy-five, reckoning in certain grand-children of Joseph. The liberty they thus took in altering the record is certainly not to be commended or imitated, but it may well bid us ask ourselves whether every single portion of the text is to be regarded as of equal authority.

Should it be pleaded that the passage *Exod. i. 5*, and, still more, the statement of Moses in his address, *Deut. x. 22*, confirm the correctness of the number seventy, it may be easily replied that the passage *Acts vii. 14* speaks as strongly for the number seventy-five. Every genuine critic will, however, see at once that St. Luke, in his report of Stephen's speech (or, it may be, Stephen himself) did but use for convenience' sake the number which the Greek text presented; and Moses may, in addressing himself to the Israelites, have used in a precisely similar manner the extant record which was eventually incorporated into the Book of Genesis. There is, indeed, another alternative. Seventy may in the lips of Moses have been merely a round number; and the computations in *Gen. xlv. 1* may have originated in the desire to shew that the names of the list there given amounted determinately to a figure which, historically viewed, was not necessarily more than approximate.

Whether the whole catalogue of *Gen. xlv. 8—27* was embodied into the Book of Genesis by Moses himself, or whether it was inserted there by some subsequent hand, such as that which added to the Book of Deuteronomy the account of Moses' death, and which, perhaps, reduced the whole of the Mosaic writings into definite and permanent order, we cannot for certain know. It is not inconsistent with the belief in the general Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch to suppose that various supplementary insertions were made in it during the lifetime of the generation that immediately succeeded to that of the great lawgiver; and certainly the catalogue which has come under our view might well be one of the portions so introduced. But in any case it may be fairly treated as a document which was already in existence, and liable to corruption, previously to its appearance in the Book of Genesis. There may be some ambiguity, at first sight, in the purport of the catalogue: there may be also minor ambiguities or inaccuracies in the names of the persons therein mentioned, in the indications of their relationship, and in the computations of their number. But there is no substantial contradiction either in the list itself or between

it and the other parts of the Mosaic narrative, which should make us hesitate to receive it in the light in which it was probably viewed by the sacred historian or editor who fixed it in its present place, as an authentic list of the more immediate posterity of Jacob from whom the Israelitish families had sprung, a link connecting the records of the history of the Israelitish nation with the records of the history of the patriarchs.

It will, perhaps, be deemed by some that we have conceded the possibility of so much error in this document, that it was hardly worth while to defend it on such terms at all. Our aim has been simply to arrive at the truth respecting it, and to shew the futility of the objection that has been based upon it to the historical credibility of the Book of Genesis. But in reference to the question whether a Scriptural genealogy may be lawfully imagined, by those who view the Scriptures as the sacred oracles of God, to be less accurate than the general body of the Scriptural narrative, we may urge the following considerations. It will scarcely be disputed by those who have studied with attention the genealogies scattered here and there through the pages of Scripture and occupying a large portion of the earlier part of the Books of Chronicles, that in the state in which, in the Hebrew text transmitted to us, they come actually before us, they are not free from serious error or confusion. Illustrations of this have been incidentally furnished by our present investigation. Howsoever, or wheresoever, that error crept in, it originated, for the most part, at a time anterior to that at which our oldest versions of the Hebrew Scriptures were made, and, therefore, very far anterior to that at which our oldest extant manuscripts of the Hebrew Scriptures were written. It had, moreover, established itself, as we see by the Greek version, before He came on earth whose way the Hebrew Scriptures helped to prepare before him. For the detection and correction of such error we are then generally dependent upon the materials with which the present received Hebrew text of the Old Testament itself supplies us. By comparing one genealogy with another, and by other like means, we can in some cases, perceiving the accident through which our documents became corrupted, restore the text, with more or less certainty, to the form in which it must originally have stood. In some cases again, though unable to grasp anew the original text of our documents, we can yet arrive at the substance of the information which it was apparently intended that they should convey. But there are other cases in which this too is lost past recall, and where the corruption that has crept in must be viewed as irreparable. Is aught gained to the honour of Scripture by the arbitrary

theory that such corruption invariably originated at a time posterior to the incorporation of the corrupted document into the sacred book or volume? Is the value of Scripture increased by the arbitrary assumption that at some definite epoch (say, for instance, the period of the formation of the Old Testament canon) it afforded correct information in some point of minor importance on which none will ever learn from it with certainty again? Better, surely, to abstain from dogmatically pronouncing on that with respect to which we are necessarily left in ignorance. We shall not lose by it in the end. The same honest criticism which refuses to make assertions the truth of which it has no means of testing, will equally refuse to call in question the general historical credibility of a book of Scripture on the ground of a minor difficulty which it cannot solve. The general narratives of Scripture were happily not liable to be so easily corrupted as the genealogies; and, in the state in which they have respectively descended to us, reason and experience alike warn us against measuring the probable correctness of the one by the standard of the apparent correctness of the other.

Having thus critically examined the first of Bishop Colenso's arguments, we may be allowed, by way of conclusion, one or two practical questions respecting his whole volume. We willingly acknowledge the religious spirit and personal faith in which he writes; but what is the wholesome doctrine to which he, an authorized Christian teacher and bishop, fain would lead us? What is the higher truth which our rejection, if there were solid grounds for rejecting it, of all that he bids us reject would help us to recognize? Is it simply that we are not to ascribe to a book those "attributes of perfection and infallibility that belong to God only?" But it is more than "the perfection and infallibility," surely, of the Bible that Bishop Colenso has assailed. What is the bearing upon our faith and religious lives of those historical narratives which are not historically credible? We know not what teaching Bishop Colenso may, in future parts of his work, have yet in store for us; but we may fairly presume that many who in the curiosity of excitement peruse his present volume will leave, unstudied and unread, any fruits of his further labours. Could it really have been a matter of urgency to seek to destroy men's belief in that respecting which he had as yet nothing positive to bring before them? For surely we shall not easily imagine that these narratives have been permitted of God to go down as sacred, both before and since the coming of our blessed Saviour, for nought. ⑥

II. WERE THE ISRAELITES ARMED?

One of Bishop Colenso's objections is based upon the word *וְהָיָה*, which occurs in Exod. xiii. 18. In the Authorized Version this verse reads thus; "But God led the people about through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea; and the children of Israel went up harnessed [marg., *or by five in a rank*] out of the land of Egypt." According to Nathan Bailey, the word "harness" means "all the accoutrements of an armed horseman; also the furniture for a horse in a coach or wagon." Now surely no one would dream of saying that the Israelites went out of Egypt in "all the accoutrements of armed horsemen." But suppose the word harness simply denotes "armour," and who would assert that the Israelites went out in armour? Yet, wherever else it occurs in the Old Testament (with one exception) harness means armour. The exception is in Jer. xlvi. 4; "Harness the horses." It can then at most be said that "harnessed" signifies "armed," and we are reminded by Dr. Colenso that the Hebrew word is so translated wherever it occurs, viz., in Joshua, i. 14; iv. 12; and Judges vii. 12. In all these places, he says, it seems to mean "armed," or "in battle array." Supposing this to be the meaning, he intimates that the narrative of the Exodus must be absurd.

But, he tells us, the difficulty of receiving this explanation has led to endeavours to find, if possible, another explanation. Hence, some have taken *וְהָיָה* to denote "five in a rank," or "by fifties." To these explanations he strongly objects. Nor will he admit the explanation which Scott adopted after Pocock, etc., that the Hebrew word means "in five distinct squadrons." This sense, he says, will not suit the other passages. He adds, as conclusive against this last meaning, "and besides, if they did not take it with them out of Egypt, where did they get the armour with which about a month afterwards they fought the Amalekites?" (Exod. xvii. 8—13). He will not allow that the Israelites obtained their weapons from the drowned Egyptian host. He therefore falls back upon the first idea of "armed," and with characteristic daring "supposes" that the whole body of 600,000 warriors were armed when they were numbered (Numb. i. 3) under Sinai. The verse alluded to is in our version thus rendered: "From twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel: thou and Aaron shall number them by their armies." On this verse a reference to the Hebrew will render it needless to say anything but that Dr. Colenso is not required by it to suppose any such thing as he

says. The whole chapter clearly indicates that the census was not of "warriors," as he perversely and obstinately calls them, but of persons "able to bear arms." If he does not see the difference, we shall not try to shew it to him. His shallow understanding of the Hebrew is not his only fault; he is illogical as well as unscholarlike. He does not see that the arms with which Amalek was routed, may have come partly with Israel out of Egypt, partly from the spoil of Pharaoh and his host, and partly from the skill and ingenuity of those who used them. Those who say *וְכָל* does not mean "armed" in Exod. xiii. 18, do not say that none of the Israelites were armed; all they say is, that that verse leaves it an open question.

Dr. Colenso calls the Hebrew word "a stubborn word," and he is right, but not in the sense he means. The stubbornness of the word arises from the fact that it is seldom employed, and was probably a regular technical, and perhaps even a military, term. This circumstance has led to many conjectures and explanations of the word both in ancient and in modern times. It may afford some pleasure to throw together some of the explanations in question. The LXX. have, "in the fifth generation." Vulg., "armati." The versions from these follow them as a matter of course, and need not be mentioned. The targum of Onkelos, "girt" or "armed" (the word is ambiguous;) Targ. of Palestine, "armed with good works;" Targ. of Jonathan, "every one with five children;" Samaritan, "in fifth generation:" Syriac, "armed" or "equipped;" Persian, "girt:" Aquila and Symmachus, "armed:" Theodotion, "in fives:" Luther, "gerüstet:" Dutch, "by vijven:" Diodati's Italian, "in ordinanza:" Swed., "wäpnada:" Saxon (mod.) "gewapent:" Junius and Tremellius, "militari ordine:" Castalio, "procincti:" several French versions, "en armes:" Genevan English, "armed," and in marg. "that is, not privily, but openly, and as the word doth signify, set in order, by five and five:" Ainsworth, "harnessed:" Pagninus, "quintati."

These are taken from versions which lie at our hand, and might be multiplied. Thus Grotius gives after Kimchi, "girt under the fifth rib." The critics and lexicographers add other suggestions.

The true explanation is, we think, to be looked for in regarding the root as the numeral five. It is well known that in our own and other languages, numerals have furnished many words which have quite lost their numeral power, or which have extended the numeral idea. Our word "decimate" is an example: "square," as applied to a body of soldiers, is another: "squadron," is another. The classical reader will be reminded

of many military and civil designations derived from numbers. Hebrew itself supplies us with derivatives of "three," "four," "ten," and perhaps others. The reason of such extensions of meaning is plain: at first the words had a direct relation to the number from which they were derived, but afterwards they were applied to things similar in some sense to the things for which they stood; or the very things they designated were altered. In our language such cases as square, squadron, quadron, hecatomb, centipede, quinquagesima, quarantine, duplicity, and a host of others are well understood, and no one hesitates about using them. It is probable that a learned "dean" might enjoy his decanal honours without seeing their connexion with the numeral "ten;" and very few of his colleagues would associate the mention of a "treble" voice with the numeral three.

But without urging any further English comparisons, let us name one in Hebrew where the word for "third" is *שליש*. This word is often found in its proper sense; but with a slightly different spelling, *שליש*, it denotes a measure (Isaiah xl. 2); a musical instrument (1 Sam. xviii. 6); and the captains of the Egyptian chariots (Exod. xiv. 7; xv. 4.) The same term is applied to officers in the Jewish army, (1 Kings ix. 22; 2 Kings x. 25. It is supposed this name was derived from the fact that war chariots often contained three men, of whom the principal warrior was called a "third." Such was Origen's opinion, and it may be correct, but like the Latin "triarii" it has been remarked that it must have lost its etymological meaning. A good lexicon will suffice to furnish several instances in which the word occurs in a conventional sense.

The application of all this to the Hebrew *חמש* will be apparent. It seems to be a military term in a conventional sense. Other explanations of the word are possible, but not necessary. However, we shall not find fault with those who say it signifies in five bodies like an army. Nor shall we deny all reason to those who think it derived from another root meaning eager, active, brave, ready prepared (for fighting) as Gesenius. All must admit with Winer that the sense of the word is disputed, and that Bishop Colenso cannot assume that it signifies either "armed" or "five in a rank." Our object will have been attained if we have succeeded in shewing that the word can furnish no basis for a positive objection to the authenticity and veracity of the Pentateuch. At the same time we have wished to shew that there is nothing unreasonable in thinking the Israelites were many of them armed in some way or other when they are recorded to have conquered Amalek.

In conclusion, then, we repeat that we believe the word

in question is a military term originally referring to some five-fold arrangement; that the Israelites were divided into separate bodies for convenience of marching; and that a word properly applied to soldiers, is, like our word "army," used of a multitude who were not "soldiers."

III. THE FAMILY OF JUDAH: MARGINAL CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIBLE.

Dr. Colenso's second and third chapters deal with a chronological difficulty. From Gen. xvi. 12, he infers that Hezron and Hamul, the sons of Pharez, are represented as having been born before the descent into Egypt. This inference is confirmed by the texts which tells us that Jacob's descendants amounted to seventy at that time, or rather to sixty-nine, since Jacob is one of the seventy. We quite believe that Bishop Colenso may reasonably defend his view on this last point. It can only be met by ingenious suppositions, which little accord with the candour and simplicity of this venerable and inartificial narrative. While, however, we admit this, we believe him to be grievously mistaken in his ultimate conclusion against the historical character of Genesis. He tells us that Judah was forty-two years old when he went into Egypt with his father, and that yet, (1) during those forty-two years he had grown up and married, and had three sons by his wife; (2) the eldest son grows up, and is married, and dies; (3) the second son marries his brother's widow and dies; (4) the third son arrives at maturity, but declines to marry the widow; (5) the widow deceives Judah and has twins by him, one of whom is Pharez; (6) Pharez grows up, marries, and has two sons before going into Egypt.

There is but one mistake which we can detect in the Bishop's enumeration; he says Shelah *declined* to marry Tamar, whereas Judah declined to give him to her (see Gen. xxxviii. 11, 14, 26). But while there is no other error in the list of facts, there is a great mistake in the assumption upon which they are founded,—that assumption is the correctness of the marginal chronology. His calculations are based upon the dates given in the margin of our version of the Bible. These dates tell us that Judah married in 1729 B.C., and had a son named Er. They also tell us that in 1706 B.C., or twenty-three years after, the family of Jacob went into Egypt. If these dates are correct, it is most im-

probable that Hezron and Hamul were born before the descent into Egypt, as the sacred history seems to teach us. Now must we, with the Bishop, reject the text and follow the marginal dates, or reject these dates and follow the text? Our election is for the text, which we maintain does not furnish us with the chronology in question. Judah, says Dr. Colenso, was born in the fourth year of Jacob's double marriage (Gen. xxix. 35). But on turning to this passage we find no such indication, except in the margin. Again, he tells us that Joseph was born in the seventh year of Jacob's marriage (Gen. xxx. 24—26, 31, 41). This is more plausible, but we must first decide the vexed question when Jacob was actually married, and also when he asked Laban to let him go. The marginal dates favour the Bishop's view, and Gen. xxxi. 41 seems not opposed to it. Still, until we know when Jacob was married we cannot even venture upon a guess as to when Joseph was born. There are, however, indications in the narrative that more than three years elapsed between the birth of Judah and that of Joseph. Two of these indications we will name, and to us they are decisive. They may be used as an *argumentum ad hominem*,—there was not time for the occurrence of the events recorded, in the three or four years which the Bishop of Natal assumes. The first indication that there was more than three years' difference between Judah and Joseph is found in Gen. xxix. 35, compared with verses 19 and 20 of chap. xxx. In the first, it is said that when Judah was born his mother left off bearing, not finally of course, but certainly for a time. But in the second passages referred to Leah is again twice a mother. According to the marginal chronology, the first of these births occurred two years after that of Judah. Assuredly, if the statement that she desisted from child-bearing is true, it cannot be correct that she had another child in two years, as the Bishop's authority, the margin, would have us believe. The same authority teaches us that between Judah's and Joseph's birth, that is, in three years, Jacob's wives and handmaids gave him seven children. These numerous births, taken in connexion with the circumstances, almost demonstrate the inaccuracy of the marginal dates. Here, we believe, is the root of the Bishop's mistake; he has been induced to rely upon these dates, and has hence naturally inferred the falsehood of the text.

We are convinced that this marginal chronology is grievously wrong, and that nothing short of the most culpable neglect allows it to retain its place. It is a scandal to an age like this to permit the continuance of what asks us to receive impossibilities, or tempts us to scepticism. Why there are myriads

who look upon this same chronology as infallible, and perhaps as a part of the Bible itself, when the fact is that it is grossly at fault, and only crept into our Bibles somewhere about the beginning of last century. It is no part of the translation certainly, no part of the Authorized Version, and was put in by no authority of either Church or State. The consequences of this wretched farrago of dates are to be seen in Dr. Colenso's leading objection to the truth of the Pentateuch. And yet we are for once grateful to him; he has rendered a real service to us by calling or leading our attention to this marginal chronology in certain parts of Genesis. We are not condemning the general system upon which these dates are based, because we are not discussing it. What we condemn is the pitiable devices and guess-work to which we owe many of the individual dates.

Now inasmuch as Dr. Colenso's calculation is trusted to this frail bark, we shall both refute him, and serve the cause of truth by shewing beyond contradiction that the marginal dates for part of the history he considers are both false and absurd. The terms which he would apply to the sacred text, we apply to the dates in the margin. A very simple statement will suffice for our purpose.

According to Gen. xxxviii. 1, 2, Judah married the daughter of Shuah. The margin gives for this event the date 1729. In verse 3, Er is born, and the margin gives no new date. In verse 5, the birth of Onan is recorded, and assigned in the margin to 1727. In verse 5, Shelah's birth is recorded, and no new date is given, nor is any other date assigned to any event afterwards recorded in the chapter; so that according to the marginal chronology, all that follows occurs in the same year, as may be seen by looking at the top of the text where 1727 is repeated, or cir. 1727, at the head of each column. And what are the events of this *annus mirabilis*? Verse 6, Er is married, *i. e.*, two years after his father's marriage! Verse 7, Er dies. Verse 8, Onan marries Tamar, the widow. Verse 10, Onan dies. Verse 11, Judah requests Tamar to go to her father, and stay till Shelah is grown up, secretly resolving that Shelah should not marry Tamar. Verse 12, in process of time, or more truly after a long time, Judah's wife dies; Judah is comforted, and goes to Timnath to sheep-shearing. Verse 13, etc., Judah commits sin with Tamar, who in due time produces two children at a birth, Pharez and Tamar. All these occurrences are assigned to the same year in the marginal chronology.

The authority which the Bishop has evidently relied upon, shuts up the birth, marriage, and death of Onan; the death of Judah's wife long after; Judah's connexion with Tamar; and

the subsequent birth of the twins, all these—in the compass of a single year! We have said nothing about Shelah's growing up in the time, because the other facts allow us to omit it: it nevertheless happened (verses 11, 14, 26).

The sacred narrative is rational and harmonious, and common sense and adverse criticism alike would find no stumbling-block in it. Dr. Colenso himself will surely admit that it is consistent and natural. It is the false light held out in the margin alone which can mislead. Judah may have been twenty years old when he married; he would probably be forty when Er married, and three or four years older when Pharez was born; in other words, he was at least as old at the birth of Pharez as he was according to Dr. Colenso and the marginal chronology when he went into Egypt. This will make him much older at that time, but it will allow for Pharez to grow up and become the father of Hezron and Hamul.

If one thing is plainer than another, it is that the events of about a quarter of a century are summarized in Gen. xxxviii., and that the marginal chronology allows two years for them.

We know well enough that this same chronology has found acceptance far and wide; but we are persuaded that chronologists had better confess the difficulty of fixing dates than put in dates at random, as they have done by mere guess work. The difficulties of deciding dates are in these brief records often insuperable, and hence we have about as many theories of chronology as we have of the Apocalypse. Meanwhile, we do feel obliged to Bishop Colenso for provoking us to call attention to the neglect and almost unfaithfulness which allows our Bibles to teach the public that a man is born, married, and buried, and that his widow long subsequently has children by another man, and all in the space of one short year.^a



^a The length to which the various observations upon Bishop Colenso's work have extended, prevents us from inserting one, the subject of which we will mention. We refer to a short account of those who have preceded the Bishop in many of his objections, or who have been occupied in answering them. Our wish to permit different solutions of some of the difficulties, is our reason for giving more than one discussion of some of them. It is true that one or two of the preceding notes agree in substance with views propounded in the first article, but this is, perhaps, a good reason for inserting them. The one in which the dates of the margin of the English Bible are animadverted upon calls our attention to a matter which we shall be happy to hear more about.—ED. J. S. L.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We wish our readers to understand that we cannot be held responsible for the opinions of our contributors and correspondents. The utmost we can do is to keep a careful eye upon the literary character of their communications, and to see that they do not transcend the limits of fair criticism and lawful inquiry.]

OUR LORD'S LAST PASSOVER.

I HAVE no new matter to produce in order to support the position which I have been maintaining against H. C., and I presume that your readers will not think any new matter necessary for this object, as that which I have already produced has been so little affected by anything that H. C. has alleged against it. But, as touching the importance of the point at issue, I have to lay before your readers new matter of the deepest interest.

Had the point at issue been merely a speculative one, I trust I should not have devoted to it so much time as it has already occupied. The great moving cause with me has been the very important bearing which it has upon present Christian life.

According to John vi. 53, Jesus said to the Jews, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;" and as St. Paul says, "The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner he took the cup when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. xi. 23, 24. Further, in your Journal for October last, p. 195, H. C. says, "There seems to be no doubt that the Eucharist in the Christian Church has taken the place of the passover in the Jewish (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). I have surely the same right to say that the Eucharist thus substituted for the passover must have been instituted at the very time the passover was partaken of, as Mr. Parker has to say that Christ must have been offered at the very hour when God ordained the Paschal lamb to be slain. I do not rely at all upon an argument of this kind, but it certainly neutralizes that of Mr. Parker." I presume that H. C. by "the very time the passover was partaken of," means the night in which Jesus was betrayed, and I hold with H. C. that the Eucharist in the Christian Church has taken the place of the passover in the Jewish, and in p. 451 of my letter in your number for January last, I say, "In this we have plain directions as to how the apostles were to keep the Paschal feast in which Jesus Christ was to be the passover lamb." Further, H. C., in referring to 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, points to a very important particular in which the Christian passover corresponded with

the Jewish. In the Jewish passover (Exod. xii. 8), "They shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread." So to make up the Christian feast there must be the actual and real presence of the Lamb of God, together with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. The presence of the unleavened bread in both cases most plainly implied the actual and real presence of the Lamb also. Thus the correspondence between the Jewish and the Christian passovers is a singularly strong argument for the actual and real presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist.

We do not assert the change of the substance of the bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord; but, we do assert that "the bread which we break is the partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise that the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ, and we pray that God "may grant us so to eat the flesh of his dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us," and the more minutely we can shew that Jesus Christ fulfilled the law in regard to the pass-over lamb, the more confident must we be of the actual and real presence of his body in the holy Eucharist, and that this is the heavenly feast in which we are to eat his flesh and drink his blood to have eternal life. Hence the great importance of shewing that Jesus Christ was not only taken up on the tenth and put to death on the fourteenth of the month, but also put to death *between the two evenings*.

I trust you will now allow me to notice that H. C. has in no way shaken the evidence which I have produced to shew that Jesus Christ was put to death *between the two evenings*.

In my last letter I first referred to the passages in the Old Testament (Exod. xii. 6; Lev. xxiii. 5; Numb. ix. 3, 5, 11), in which the time for killing the lamb is described as being *between the two evenings*. I then referred to the passages in the Old Testament (Exod. xxix. 39, 41; Numb. xxviii. 4, 8, 9), in which the time for killing the daily evening sacrifices is also described as being *between the two evenings*, and I urged that the time for killing these daily evening sacrifices must have been before sunset, as these (especially described as being the second sacrifices for the day) were to be killed on the same Jewish day as those of the morning, and this is especially to be noticed in regard to the sacrifices which were to be offered on the Sabbath days, and I produced from Philo and Josephus testimony to prove that in their time the time for killing the daily evening sacrifices, as well as the passover lambs, was before sunset. From this I concluded that the *between the two evenings* for killing the passover lambs must mean between noon and sunset, and how is this met by H. C.? In p. 195 of your last number, H. C. says,—“Mr. Parker relies a good deal upon the fact (not denied by me) that the *daily sacrifice*, commanded to be slain ‘between the evenings,’ was slain, and with propriety, *before* sunset and at the close of the day. This is no proof that the Paschal lamb must have been slain before sunset, since, as we have seen, the phrase includes the time before and subsequent to sunset.”

In p. 195 H. C. also says, "In endeavouring to overturn my reasoning, that the time 'between the evenings' means, *in the case of the Paschal lamb*, the time subsequent to sunset, Mr. Parker makes a very extraordinary assertion. He evidently allows that the expression signifies the time from the decline of the sun to the departure of twilight, and yet he says that 'no time after the beginning of the second evening could be said to be between the two evenings.'" This is a very great misconception on the part of H. C. as to what I allow.

I admit that the first of the two evenings ended at sunset, and that the second of the two began at sunset and extended beyond it; but, my whole object is to prove that the time which is called *between the two evenings* must have been between the beginning of the first and the beginning of the second evening, and thus H. C. has not at all disturbed the argument which I drew from the time of killing the daily evening sacrifices.

I next produced Deut. xvi. 6, where the time of killing the passover is described as being *at the going down of the sun*, and to shew what was meant by this expression I referred to Josh. x. 27, and Josh. viii. 29. Josh. viii. 29 refers to the time, at which the king of Ai, who had been hung, was taken down from the tree. H. C. admits that in the Hebrew the phrases in Deut. xvi. 6, and Josh. viii. 29 are identical, and that if the king were taken down at the hour required by the precept and the practice of the Jews (Deut. xxi. 23, Josh x. 27), it must have been before sunset, and in your p. 196, H. C. says: "From this precept and from Jewish practice (Joshua x. 27), there is much force in this argument. But I contend for all that, that our translation is right, and that in this instance Joshua did leave a man hanging until after sunset. Had I no other ground I would go fearlessly upon the proper force of the Hebrew phrase itself. Is it certain that a precept was always observed—that there might be no exceptional cases? Is it certain that what was usually done was always done? Certainly not. And I maintain that in Joshua viii. 29 we have a case where the precept of Deut. xxi. 23 was departed from. Let us see if we have not enough to shew that there were cases where this precept was not acted on." H. C. refers to the taking down of Jesus and the two malefactors from the cross (John xix. 31). It is quite true that the approaching Sabbath and not the precept of Deut. xxi. 23 is the only reason mentioned for their being taken down before sunset. But still they were taken down before sunset in strict accordance with the precept, and so these cases are quite against, instead of being in favour of H. C., and is it not far more probable that H. C. is wrong in his interpretation of the Hebrew phrase in Joshua viii. 29, than that Joshua, without any assignable reason, should leave the king of Ai hanging after sunset, contrary both to the precept and the practice of the Jews, especially when the language in Joshua viii. 29 is equivalent to the language in which the time for killing of the daily evening sacrifices is described, and H. C. does not attempt to deny that these were always killed before sunset. The time in Deut. xvi. 6 is equivalent to the time in Exodus xii. 6, and the time in Exodus xii. 6 is equivalent to the time in Exodus xxix. 39. Therefore

the time in Joshua viii. 29, which is equivalent to the time in Deut. xvi. 6, must be equivalent to the time in Exodus xxix. 39, and this refers to the killing of the daily evening sacrifices.

H. C. also admits that in the case of the five kings, Joshua x. 27, Joshua commanded them to be taken down before sunset in accordance with the law.

I have also referred to Deut. xxiv. 13, as explaining the meaning of the expression in Deut. xvi. 6, and H. C. also admits that the phrases are identical in the Hebrew.

Deut. xxiv. 13 refers to the restoring of a debtor's pledge, and I have shewn from Josephus (*Ant.*, iv. 8, 26) that the time for restoring a pledge was before sunset. Upon this H. C. says: "In the preceding verse the creditor is told that he must not *sleep* with the debtor's pledge. Hence we see that the object of the command is to deliver back the pledge in sufficient time to enable the poor debtor to use his pledge as his covering by night, which would be done by restoring it during the twilight subsequent to sunset." But of course, it would be done, as effectually at least, by restoring it before sunset, and I presume your readers will prefer the interpretation put upon this expression by the Jews, as recorded by Josephus, to the reasoning of H. C. This would give the meaning that is given to the equivalent of these same words by the practice of the Jews in slaying their daily evening sacrifices.

I next proceed to shew that the meaning which I have thus elicited for the period *between the two evenings* is confirmed by the account which is given by the Exodus. Upon this H. C. in p. 197 of your last Number says: "I will now shew that Mr. Parker's reasons for his opinion do not bear him out. In the first place, Exodus xii. 22, shews us beyond any question that Israel did not march during the hours of the night, as Mr. Parker imagines, for they are there commanded not to go out of the door of their houses until the morning." I do not hold that the Israelites took their departure until after the Lord had smitten the Egyptians, and this smiting was at midnight, and I presume that any hour after midnight would be morning, at least for this purpose. Further, H. C. says, "Again, Deut. xvi. 6, tells us that the time of their first march was evening, and not night." But, according to my understanding of Deut. xvi. 6, it tells us nothing about the time of their first march, as to whether it was evening or night. As I understand the verse, the season that they came out of Egypt has no reference whatever to the hour of the day, but to the month of the year (mentioned in v. 1.) in which the Lord brought them out. It is manifest that the hour at which they killed the passover could not have been the hour at which they made their first march. To shew that they could not have marched at an hour's notice, H. C. says: "*A disciplined army could not do it.*" Holding that the Israelites were under the immediate direction and guidance of God, I hold that they could do what a disciplined army could not do. In p. 420 of your number for July I have said, "that there was not a delay of some twenty-four hours is evident from the circumstance that the people took their dough before it was leavened." Upon this H. C. in p. 197 says, "But we are

told (verse 34) that the reason they took the dough unleavened was, not that it had not time to be leavened, but that their kneading-troughs were bound up and could not be used." Let this be the reason for their not leavening their dough, and I have only to ask H. C. what was the reason why they bound up their kneading-troughs after their meal had been converted into dough, and before it had been leavened. What could it have been, but extreme haste? Further, in p. 198, H. C. also says: "Mr. Parker also says in proof of his view, that the Egyptians had strength to expel Israel, and that the latter were in fear of the Egyptians, and that consequently they marched the moment they were told. I think he will see on a more careful consideration of the chapter, that *at the time spoken of* it was the Egyptians who were in mortal fear of Israel, not *vice versa*, and that they would have dreaded making use of any violence." In Exodus xi. 1, it is said—"Afterwards he will let you go hence: when he shall let you go, he shall surely thrust you hence altogether." But, how could there be a thrusting out by Pharaoh, if he had not the power, or, if he had dreaded making use of any violence? And in p. 421 of your number for July I said: "They (the Egyptians) doubtless feared how far the destroying angel might proceed, if the Israelites remained any longer in the land." Nor is this fear on the part of the Egyptians inconsistent with the supposition that Pharaoh did not fear the Israelites themselves, nor, with the supposition that the Israelites were then afraid of the Egyptians, as they had been before and were afterwards; for, both Pharaoh and the Israelites well knew that it was not the Israelites themselves, who had destroyed the firstborn of the Egyptians. That the Israelites were afraid of the Egyptians before their departure is evident from the repeated plagues which Moses was obliged to inflict upon the Egyptians before the Israelites could obtain their release. See Ex. vi. 1.

In p. 198, H. C. also says: "In following out his view here, Mr. Parker falls into a mistake about the feast of the passover, into which I myself fell in the first edition of my essay on the chronology of our Lord's Last Passover, and from the same reason, namely, from adopting the account of Josephus instead of adhering to the account of Scripture." Whatever mistake I may have made, I do not adopt the account of Josephus, instead of adhering to the account of Scripture, but endeavour to shew that both accounts are alike. I state that Josephus in one place calls the feast of unleavened bread a feast of seven and in another place calls it a feast of eight days. I also notice that according to Levit. xxiii. 5, 6, the 15th day of the month was the first day of the feast, and this would make it a feast of seven days; but, according to St. Mark, xiv. 12, the 14th day of the month was regarded as the first day, and this would make it a feast of eight days; for, according to both Scripture and Josephus, the feast included and ended with the 21st day of the month; and whether the feast be considered as one of seven or of eight days, or the same as the feast of the passover or not, had nothing whatever to do with my arguments upon the points at issue.

In p. 181 of your number for April last H. C. says: "Mr. Parker's letter (of January last) then would seem to leave my argument untouched. He has not impugned my interpretations of any of those passages of the Old Testament by which the question must be decided, and on which I still rely with perfect confidence." In my letter of July, p. 417, I also said: "The direct evidence as to the hour (of killing the passover) is of course to be found only in the Old Testament," and I trust I have now not only impugned H. C.'s interpretations of all the passages of the Old Testament, by which the question must be decided, but also shewn that H. C.'s replies to my objections to his interpretations are of no weight whatever, and that according to the Old Testament the time for killing the passover was between noon and sunset, and thus Jesus Christ must have been put to death at the proper time for killing the passover, and if this be true, H. C. would of course admit that our Lord did not eat the passover the night before his crucifixion.

I should also notice another strange misconception on the part of H. C. In p. 199 of your number for October last, H. C. says, "Mr. Parker sets John in opposition to the earlier gospels. I endeavour to reconcile them without explaining away the statement of either."

Instead of setting John in opposition to the earlier gospels, I expressly said in my last letter, p. 424, "Is it not exceedingly difficult to conceive that when St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke speak of eating the passover, they mean the legal passover; but that when St. John speaks of eating the passover, he means a feast which was not the legal passover?" And when in p. 62 of your number for October, 1861, H. C. says, "The three earlier evangelists speak only of the Lord's passover; John speaks of that of the nation generally," what is this, but an explaining away either of the statement of St. John, or of the statements of the other evangelists as to eating the passover? On my charging H. C. with explaining away either the statement of St. John or the statements of the other evangelists in calling the day of the crucifixion the day of the preparation, H. C., in p. 199 of your number for last October, says, "But, it so happens, that while St. John calls the time of our Lord's trial and crucifixion the preparation of the passover, the other evangelists speak of it as the preparation of the Sabbath. So that Mr. Parker has not even the grounds he seems to think he has from this identity of phrase: for while both speak of the day as the day of the preparation, the synoptic gospels speak of the preparation of the sabbath, and John of the preparation of the passover." But here H. C. seems strangely to forget his own statement in p. 69 of your number for October, 1861. There he says, "According to the original institution, indeed, the preparation of the passover was made upon the same day on which it was eaten. Such was our Saviour's passover, prepared and eaten the same day." Thus, according to H. C. himself, the day of the crucifixion was the preparation of our Lord's passover, and it is of this passover that St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke speak, according to H. C. How then can H. C. object to my considering St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, as speaking of the day of the crucifixion as being the preparation of the

passover? It is quite true, that neither St. Matthew, St. Mark, nor St. Luke, calls it in express terms the preparation of the passover; but, Matthew xxvi. 19; Mark xiv. 16; and Luke xxii. 13; all say that on this day they made *ready* the passover, and what is this in effect but calling the day the preparation of the passover? I should also notice that the day following the day on which they killed the passover, that is, the 15th of Nisan, was always a sabbath, whether it fell on a Saturday or not (Levit. xxiii. 6, 7); and thus the day on which they killed the passover, must always have been the preparation of a sabbath, as well as the preparation of the passover. H. C. does not attempt to refute my charge of his explaining away the statements of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, as to eating the passover.

In p. 194 of your number for October last, H. C. also says, "Three evangelists give a plain account of our Lord's partaking of the passover." That an inference to this effect should be drawn from the statements of the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, if these statements be taken without reference to the statement of St. John, and the statements in the Old Testament which bear upon the point, I am not surprised; but, that the statement of H. C. should be repeatedly and deliberately made after reference to St. John and the Old Testament, is a matter of great surprise.

The best interpreter of Scripture is Scripture, and your readers must decide which of us it is that best understands what it is that the three evangelists really do say in the matter.

Further, whatever be the hour at which the law commanded the passover to be slain, it is clear that Jesus Christ could not have kept the passover at the right time before His crucifixion, if He himself was crucified at the right time for killing the passover lamb.

I have yet another word, and that one upon a point of very great importance. "In p. 194 of your last number, H. C. says, "Mr. Parker does not reason from the Hebrew original, but from the Septuagint translation. He can never succeed in a question of this kind in this way. The Septuagint is no more decisive of the real meaning of a passage in the Old Testament than our Authorized version is of a passage in the New." But, can H. C. have read the LXX. translation, and compared its Greek with the Greek of the New Testament, and not have come to the conclusion that in all probability the LXX. translation was that which the writers of the New Testament called the Scriptures?

The importance of the LXX. translation as a means of conveying to the learned world the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures on the first preaching of Christianity, should also be borne in mind. Their language was not Hebrew. Nor can we doubt but that when the LXX. translation was made, the best copies of the Hebrew original were used, and the most able men of the time were employed for the work, and that they brought to their work a more accurate knowledge of the Hebrew language than is possessed by any of the present day. Nor did there exist any bias in favour of Christianity to give a colouring to the translation.

But above all, Dr. Randolph has compared the quotations of the Old Testament in the New with the original Hebrew and with the LXX translation, and I will give you an abstract of the result of his labours, as given in his indices.

Index I.—1. Citations agreeing exactly with the Hebrew, 63.

2. Agreeing nearly with Hebrew, 63.

3. Agreeing in sense with Hebrew, but not in words, 24.

4. Giving the general sum, but abridging or adding to it, 8.

5. Taken from several passages of S. S., 3.

6. Differing from Hebrew but agreeing with Septuagint, 6.

7. Citations where we have reason to suspect that the Apostles either read the Hebrew differently, or put some sense upon the words different from what our Lexicons express, 21.

8. Places where the Hebrew seems to be corrupted, 8.

9. Not properly citations, but references or allusions, 3.

Index II.—1. Agreeing verbatim with Septuagint, or only changing the person, etc., 72.

2. Taken from Septuagint, but with some variation, 47.

3. Agreeing in sense, but not in words with Septuagint, 30.

4. Differing from Septuagint, but agreeing exactly, or nearly with Hebrew, 13.

5. Differing both from Septuagint and from Hebrew, and taken probably from some other translation or paraphrase, 19.

The number of citations considered by Dr. Randolph is 181, and of these his No. 159 is placed by him among the 47 which are taken from the Septuagint, but with some variation, and also among the eight places where the Hebrew seems to be corrupted.

In his annotation upon this citation, he says, "The chief difficulty is how to reconcile either the Septuagint or the apostle with the Hebrew. See Kennicott, *Dissert.*, S 18, 5, and S 77. From hence I think we may reasonably infer that the Hebrew text is corrupted; and his especially, as it is not easy to make sense of the present reading." The observation of Kennicott upon this citation, is, "Affirmat auctor Epistolæ ad Hebræos (x. 5), Psalten (xl. 7), introduxisse Messiam licentem—corpus parasti mihi. Et quum Apostolus argumentatur ex voce corpus, 'corpus Messiae semel immolandum pro omnibus;' hæc vox omnino necessaria videtur in Veteri Testamento, ut justa sit quum in Novo Testamento habemus citatio."

So little would the passage, as it stands in the Hebrew original have been to the purpose, that we can scarcely suppose that the Apostle would have quoted it at all, and what would have been our loss in this matter without the LXX. translation?

As it is in the LXX. translation we have the incarnation of our Lord most plainly foretold; but not only so, the passage must also be regarded as a plain prophecy that as to the body, which our Lord would thus assume, God would have pleasure in it, when offered as a sacrifice for sin, and it is of this body that Jesus Christ said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."

In these days then, especially when vicarious suffering as an atonement for sin is denied, and the example of Jesus Christ is set forth as being all that God did for the world by sending his Son to take our nature upon him, it behoves us to use our best endeavours to place beyond doubt the truth of the great doctrine of the atonement for sin by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and the actual and real presence of his body in the Eucharist, as the food of our spiritual life.

I will now produce another instance in which the Septuagint translation differs materially from the Hebrew original, but which is not quoted in the New Testament. Jeremiah (xxii. 30) speaks of Jeconiah, or Jehoiachin, and says, "Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah." But, in 1 Chron. iii. 16, 17, we read that Salathiel was the son of Jeconiah, and from Matt. i. 11, 12 we learn that the genealogy of Jesus Christ was traced down through Jechoniah and his son Salathiel. Hence, reason tells us that Jechoniah was not childless, and the account in the LXX. translation is, "Write this man *proscribed*" (ἐκκήρυκτον), and we learn from 2 Kings xxiv. 17 that Zedekiah, who succeeded Jechoniah on the throne of Judah, and was its last king, was not the son, but the uncle of Jechoniah. From this, reason tells us that in this passage also the reading of the LXX. translation is to be preferred to that of the Hebrew original. I therefore presume that H. C. will no longer contend that *the Septuagint is no more decisive of the real meaning of a passage in the Old Testament than our Authorized Version is of a passage in the New.*

Thus there are instances, in which one may reason from the LXX. translation against the Hebrew original, and when passages occur, in which there is a material variation between the Hebrew original and the LXX translation, reason, judging from the context and other attending circumstances, must decide to which the preference is to be given.

That the LXX translation is with me as to Deut. xvi. 6, seems to be admitted by H. C. Thus, in p. 58 of your Journal for October, 1861, he says, "Now let us remember that when the translation of the Septuagint was made, the Jews killed the passover *before sunset*, and maintained that this was the proper time. In the Septuagint translation then of Deut. xvi. 6, it was necessary to translate the phrase by 'about sunset,' in order to make it in accordance with the established Jewish custom, and not directly contradictory of it. Hence arose their translation, and therefore it has little or no weight." This is a bold statement, and I know not upon what authority it is made; but what is the amount of variation between the Hebrew original and the LXX. translation as to the point at issue, and what is the amount of advantage that I have sought to gain by reasoning from the LXX. translation? The identical expression in the Hebrew original occurs in Deut. xvi. 6, xxiv. 13, and Joshua viii. 29, and H. C., from grammatical reasons, thinks it ought to be translated *when the sun was set*. But, the meaning as elicited from grammatical construction is disputed. In p. 57 of your Journal for October, 1861, H. C. says, "In the Hebrew the

particle ך is joined to an infinitive of motion, and we maintain that in every instance where this particle is joined to an infinitive of motion or action it is indicative of this motion or action as past." But in p. 191 of your Journal for October last, Mr. Wratislaw says, "Surely the indefinite infinitive, especially when joined to the indefinite ך, may represent the secondary or imperfect tense ך, quite as well as the past tense ך, and may correspond to the Greek ἐπιδύνοντος τοῦ ἡλίου quite as well as to ἐπιδύντος. And it is quite clear that the LXX. understood it so." Perhaps the doubt existing as to the meaning of this expression may be best seen from the different ways in which it has been translated. I will set forth such as are given in Walton's *Polyglott*.

	DEUT. xvi. 16.	DEUT. xxiv. 13.	JOSH. viii. 29.
Latin version of Hebrew.	Circa ingredi solem.	Sicut ingredi solem.	Circa ingredi solem.
Vulgate.	Ad solis occasum.	Ante solis occasum.	Ad solis occasum.
Syriac.	Ad solis occasum.	Cum sol occubuerit.	Cumque sol occubuisset
Arabic.	Ante occasum solis.	Ad occasum solis.	Ad occasum solis.
Heb. Samaritan.	Cum occidit sol.	Cum occiderit sol.	
Parap. Chald.	Ad occasum solis.	Cum occubuerit sol.	Ut intravit sol.
LXX.	Πρὸς δύσματος ἡλίου.	Πρὸς δυσμὰς ἡλίου.	Ἐπιδύνοντος τοῦ ἡλίου.
English Bible.	At the going down of the sun.	When the sun goeth down.	As soon as the sun was down.

Thus the LXX. translation of Joshua viii. 29, is even more in my favour than its translation of Deut. xvi. 6. But, instead of reasoning from the grammatical construction of the expression either in the Hebrew original, or in the LXX. translation, I have reasoned from the circumstances with which the expression is connected in both, and which are not denied by H. C. Thus, Deut. xxiv. 13, refers to the restoration of a pledge, and I have shewn from Josephus that the pledge was to be restored *before* the going down of the sun, and in this Josephus is speaking of what was the law, and no doubt the practice of the Jews was in accordance with the law. From this I concluded that the same expression in Deut. xvi. 6, could not mean *after* sunset. To meet this, H. C. argues that by restoring the pledge during the twilight subsequent to sunset, it would have been in sufficient time to enable the poor debtor to use his pledge as his covering by night. This might be admitted; but this of itself would not prove that it must therefore have been restored after sunset. If H. C. had also shewn that by restoring it before sunset, it would not have been in sufficient time for the debtor's covering by night, he might then have reasonably contended that it ought to have been restored after sunset. But this he has failed to do, and so has left my argument from the pledge untouched. Joshua viii. 29 refers to the taking down of the king of Ai from the tree. I have shewn, from Deut. xxi. 23, that according to the law, a man who had been hung was to be taken down the same day, that is, before sunset, and I have also shewn that in accordance with this law our Lord and the two malefactors were taken down from the cross

before sunset; and from this I have contended that the king of Ai must also have been taken down before sunset, and from thence argued that the same expression in Deut. xvi. 6 must also mean before sunset; and how does H. C. meet this? He admits that the law and the practice are as I state. Nor does he deny that Joshua took down the five kings before sunset (Joshua x. 27); but he is confident that he has rightly interpreted Deut. xvi. 6, and therefore concludes that the king of Ai must have been taken after sunset. But this is no evidence that H. C. has rightly interpreted Deut. xvi. 6. If H. C. could have shewn from any other source that the king of Ai was taken down after sunset, he might thence have reasonably argued that the same expression in Deut. xvi. 6 must also have meant after sunset. But as it is, he has also left this my argument quite untouched. Of course H. C. is ready to admit that the LXX. translators must have been under the impression that the king of Ai was taken down before sunset.

I have also referred to the time of killing the daily evening sacrifices, and drawn the same conclusion from it, and this has been met merely by a supposition that I admitted that the period *between the two evenings* included the time before and subsequent to sunset. This would be to admit a point which throughout I have been striving to disprove.

Thus the amount of advantage, which I have sought to obtain by reasoning from the Septuagint translation instead of the Hebrew original, is nothing.

Mr. Wratishaw, in p. 191 of your Journal for October last, says: "Mr. Parker, in p. 419 of your last number, has not made the most of his argument from Joshua viii. 29, which he should have translated, 'And as soon as the sun *was setting*, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcase down;' " and in p. 196 of your last number, H. C., in reference to Joshua viii. 29, says: "If Mr. Parker had here brought forward the Hebrew, it would have made his case appear stronger, for the phrases in the Hebrew are identical."

Further: as I have shewn that even in cases where there is a material variation between the Hebrew original and the LXX. translation, the attending circumstances must be allowed to determine to which the preference is to be given, so much more must such circumstances be allowed to determine the meaning of disputed expressions, whether they occur in the Hebrew original, or in the LXX. translation. As I have already said, the best interpreter of Scripture is Scripture.

Luffincott, Devon,

FRANKE PARKER.

29th October, 1862.

I SHOULD be sorry if the interesting discussion which has appeared in your pages on the difficulty about the Last Passover should be closed, without another solution being presented to your readers, which has long appeared to me to be the true one.

I entirely agree with Mr. Constable in his closing words (*J. S. L.* for October last, p. 199), "The synoptic gospels say that our Lord par-

took of his passover in the evening before his crucifixion; and St. John says, that on the day of the crucifixion the Jews had not partaken of theirs;” and that the real question is, how this discrepancy is to be *explained*, for it cannot be explained *away* without putting the most unnatural sense on words—a thing to be avoided, especially in dealing with Holy Scripture. I also agree with him in thinking, that the discrepancy is to be explained on the principle that there were *two recognized times* for observing the passover, at least in most cases.

I. Now it is a certain fact, that the modern Jews all over the world observe the passover,—and not only the passover, but the new moons and other great feasts—in duplicate, on two consecutive days. The learned Jesuit Egidius Bucherius, *anglicè* Giles Boucher (*In Victorii Canonem Paschalem Commentarius*, folio, Antwerpiæ, 1633, p. 379), devotes a whole chapter to the examination of the question, “Num Judei olim, ut hodie, Neomenias suas et alia solemnia biduo instaurarint;” and he cites several learned writers for the affirmative, especially (as regards the passover) Paul de Middleburg, bishop of Fossombrone, from whose work, *De rectâ Paschæ celebratione et de die passionis Christi* (folio, Forosempronii, 1513) he extracts the following passage, bearing directly on our present subject: “Cum Judei per captivitatem Babylonicam bonis omnibus cunctâque suppellectili et libris spoliati essent, neque lunæ cursum per supputationes indagare valerent, solo visu Lunam observabant. Quamobrem ne in solemnitate Festi Paschalis celebrandâ errarent, statuerunt Festum Paschæ duobus diebus continuis observandum esse, ut si forte in uno erraverint commissum errorem in altero emendarent. Hos autem duos dies pro uno computabant, sicut hac tempestate faciunt Romani in observatione Bissexti, qui juxta Cæsaris constitutionem quarto quoque anno duos dies appellatos Bissextos pro uno computant. Quinimò, ut inquit Celsus Juris-consultus, si quis natus est sexto Kalendas Martias nihil refert utrùm priore an posteriore die natus sit, cum illud biduum pro uno tantùm die habeatur. Sicque in anno Bissextili licèt Februarius reverà habeat dies 29, tamen per decretum Julii Cæsaris et juxta computationem Romanorum nunquam habet dies plures quam 28, quia duo dies Bissextiles pro uno computantur, et uterque eorum vocatur Sextus Kalendarum Martii. Eodem modo duo Festa Paschalia à Judeis tunc observata pro uno die computabantur, et duobus diebus continuis Luna dicebatur quarta-decima. Similiter quinta-decima dies Mensis Nisan per intercalationem alterius diei reiterabatur, et bis observabatur. Neque hoc negavit Judæus, imo facile admisit, nam et usque in hodiernum diem multi imo fere omnes Judæi eadem observant, dicentes sic ab Esdrâ Scribâ in secundâ Templi ædificatione, dum coram populo Volumen Legis exponeret, institutum fuisse. Quamobrem Rabbi Rava adhortatus fuit Judæos sui temporis, ne deserant consuetudinem à Patribus observatam, commonefaciens eos ut Festa solemnia duobus diebus continuis celebrent sicut præcepit Esdras.”

But the narratives of the Evangelists themselves indicate, that there was a recognized difference of times for observing the passover and the feast of tabernacles: for, 1. Our Lord sent a message by Peter and

John to the householder in Jerusalem, "The Master saith, My time is at hand, I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples :"
 ὁ καιρὸς μοῦ ἐγγύς ἐστι, "My time"—not "mine hour," i. e. of suffering, but—"My time" (καιρὸς) of keeping the passover "is at hand." Our Lord, at John vii. 6, 8, uses the same word καιρὸς for the "time" of going up to the feast of tabernacles, and contrasts *his* time and his *brethren's* time—ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς . . . ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος—ἐγὼ οὕτως ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην, ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὕτως πεπλήρωται. Our Lord, therefore, assumed that the householder recognized a difference of times, and merely asserted καιρὸς μοῦ ἐγγύς ἐστι, i. e., I shall eat my passover *to-night*, not *to-morrow* night. 2. The fact of the man carrying the pitcher of water, usually characteristic of the hour of sunset, shews that special preparations were making at a much earlier hour for passover purposes. And once more, 3. The fact that the "large upper room" was "furnished and prepared" (Mark xiv. 15) implies, that the householder thought it probable he might have applications for the use of his apartment on *that* day, as well as on the *following* day. I consider the point therefore as made good, that *there were two recognized times for observing the passover* when our Lord was upon earth.

Bucherius, however, thinks that this custom was far more ancient than even the time of Ezra, and that it was to be traced to a deeper cause than that assigned by Paul de Middleburg, viz., to the double commencement of the month in most cases, according as it was computed from the day of the moon's actual change, or from the day following. It is obvious that the change of the moon might happen at any time in the twenty-four hours, and (unless the change happened exactly at sunset) the former part of the day of change would be under the old moon, and the latter part under the new moon (like the Greek τριακάς, or ἔνη καὶ νέα); and if the whole day were deemed as consecrated by its latter portion, it would be observed as the new moon; the next day, however, would be popularly regarded as the new moon, because it was the first day which came wholly under the new moon. In the history of David we have a decided trace of a two-day observance of the new moon: David says to Jonathan, "Behold *to-morrow* is the new moon, and I should not fail to sit with the king at meat; but let me go, that I may hide myself in the field unto *the third day at even*" (1 Sam. xx. 5). This is echoed by Jonathan at verses 12, 18, 19. Saul made no comment on David's absence the first day (ver. 26); but "on the morrow, which was the second day of the month," Saul asked, "Wherefore cometh not the son of Jesse to meat, *neither yesterday nor to-day?*" (ver. 27). It is plain that Saul would have been satisfied with David's attendance at court on the *second* day, as a sufficient observance of the feast of the new moon. Here then is a clear indication of a two-day observance of the new moon. (See also Judith viii. 6). Now if there were a double Nisan 1, there might be a double Nisan 14 and a double Nisan 15; and, moreover, if these double days were by common consent regarded each as only one day protracted (as Paul de Middleburg suggests), we can understand how the lambs killed on the Thursday and Friday might be said to be *all* killed "on the first day of unleavened

bread" (Mark xiv. 12 ; Luke xxii. 7), seeing that the two days were regarded as forming one protracted Nisan 14. The foregoing solution then of the vexed question I beg to offer to the candid consideration of your readers, as meeting every point in the sacred narrative, and as being based on a confessedly very ancient practice, viz., the two-day observance of the new moon, at least in most cases.

I say in "most cases:" for if we suppose the moon to be at the full a little *after* sunset, *that* day will be the day of full moon, distant from the preceding change by fourteen complete days + a little less than 18h. 22m. (for half a mean lunation = 14d. 18h. 22m.), and we might have a two-day Neomenia, and a two-day 14th and 15th for that month; but suppose the full moon to happen a little *before* sunset, *this* day will be the full moon, distant from the preceding change by only thirteen complete days + a little more than 18h. 22m., in which case there could be only one Neomenia, and one 14th and 15th for that month. In short, whenever the change of moon happens more than 22m. before midnight, or between sunset and 11.38 P.M., there can only be a single Neomenia and single feast days for that month; for in such a case, a second Nisan 1 would throw the second Nisan 15 into the day after the full moon, which was never allowed. Greswell shews from Josephus, Philo Judæus, and some fragments earlier than the Christian era, that the common mode of finding the passover at that period was to consider the day of full moon as Nisan 15, and consequently the day before the full moon as Nisan 14 (see *Greswell's Dissertations*, vol. i., *Diss. v.*). Hervatius, therefore, cautiously says, in his *Chronologia Nova*, cap. 177, "Constat Judæos circa Christi tempora Festa sua *plerumque* biduo celebrasse, uti fusè Paulus Middleburgensis."

II. There is another solution founded on the same principle of *two recognized times*, adopted by Joannes Gerhardus, in his continuation of *Chemnitius's Harmony*. He produces a rabbinical rule "Never to observe two Sabbaths on two consecutive days *propter olera atque mortuos* (i.e., on account of the difficulty of keeping boiled vegetables and dead corpses so long); but to avoid the inconvenience by postponing the first Sabbath, and blending its observances with those of the second." Now suppose the Thursday to have been the true Nisan 14, the Friday would be Nisan 15—a Sabbath by the Mosaic law; the next day being the weekly Sabbath, the Friday ceremonies would, by the rule in question, be postponed to the Saturday, and of course those of the Thursday (or Nisan 14) to the Friday. But Bucherius (p. 392), Petavius, and others who refer to this rabbinical rule, say that the Jewish writers, and among them Maimonides himself, confessed that this rule was made subsequently to the Dispersion. I find a proof of this in Josephus (*Antiquit.*, xiii., viii. 4, cited by Mr. Parker last July for a different purpose), where, after making the following quotation from the *History of Nicolaus of Damascus*—"When Antiochus [the Pious] had erected a trophy at the river Lycus, upon his conquest of Indates, the general of the Parthians, he stayed there *two days*. It was at the desire of Hyrcanus the Jew, because it was such a festival derived

to them from their forefathers, whereon the law of the Jews did not allow them to travel.”--Josephus adds: “And truly he did not speak falsely in saying so, for that festival which we call *Pentecost* did then fall out to be the *next day to the Sabbath*; nor is it lawful for us to journey on the Sabbath day or on a festival day.” From these words it is evident, that down to the time of Josephus, no such rule was known among the Jews, as that two Sabbaths should not be observed on two consecutive days. I feel no doubt, therefore, that the other is the true solution of our question.

III. Now it is an interesting point of enquiry, with which I shall close my communication, whether this solution will *astronomically* fit the year and month, in which it is most probable that our Lord was crucified; in other words, whether the month in which our Lord most probably suffered was a month which had a double Neomenia, and a double Nisan 14 falling on a Thursday and Friday. In the Appendix to Elliott’s *Warburtonian Lectures* (London, 1859, p. 461), and at the end of vol. iii. of the new (5th) edition of Elliott’s *Horæ Apocal.*, is printed a Table, calculated by Professor Airy, Astronomer Royal, of the “Times of New and Full Moon (Jerusalem mean solar time, civil reckoning) in the months of March and April, A.D. 29 to 34.” The year which seems to possess the best claims to be considered the true one is A.D. 29, as might be proved by many arguments: *inter alia*, Tertullian—a most acute man, who searched and studied the veritable *Acta* or despatches of Pilate to Tiberius in the archives at Rome, and appealed to them in his writings in defence of Christianity—at the end of the second century, asserts that “Christ was revealed” (*i. e.* commenced his public ministry) “*a duodecimo anno Tiberii*,” *i. e.* A.D. $\frac{25}{26}$, and suffered “*coss. duobus Geminis, mense Martii*,” *i. e.* March, A.D. 29. Now what says Professor Airy’s Table?^a

Year.	True Time of		Mean Time of	
	New Moon.	Full Moon.	New Moon.	Full Moon.
A.D. 29.	March 4, Friday, 2h. 26m. A.M.	March 18, Friday, 9h. 26m. P.M.	March 3, Thursday, midnight.	March 18, Friday, 6h. 12m. P.M.

In reading this Table, we must recollect that the Jewish day turned at sunset, and its first six hours, from sunset to midnight, formed a part of the day which we commence from midnight. Bearing this in mind, we learn from the Table that in A.D. 29 the change of moon in March took place on March 4th, at 2h. 26m. A.M. by true time, and at midnight by mean time: hence there might be a double Neomenia and a double Nisan 14 and 15 that month: moreover, the double Nisan 14 would fall on *Thursday, March 17th*, and *Friday, March 18th*. The full moon, moreover, happened on *Saturday, March 19th*, three hours

^a The Professor has most obligingly recalculated these times for me by the most recent Lunar Tables (Hansen’s), bearing the Professor’s new correction for the moon’s mean motion. He also writes, “I do not doubt that the young moon would be visible to the naked eye on the evening of March 4, the true conjunction having taken place at 2.26 A.M.”

twenty-six minutes after sunset by true time, and soon after sunset by mean time, which would be the popular Nisan 15 by Josephus's rule, and the *Friday* Nisan 14. These results are exactly what we wanted.

Professor Airy suspects that March 18 would be too early in the year for the passover. In reply to which objection I observe, that though it was popularly understood that Nisan 14 was to be at the vernal equinox, and when the sun was in Aries, the Mosaic law said nothing about the equinox, or Aries, or the full moon; and it is a well established fact, that the Jews in our Lord's time, and long after, often observed the passover *before* March 25, or viii. Cal. April. The only regulation in the Mosaic law which defined the season of Nisan 14 is, that "green ears of corn dried by the fire" should be offered as "first-fruits of the harvest" on Nisan 16 (Lev. ii. 14; xxiii. 10, 11, 14); in allusion to which our Lord, who rose on Nisan 16, is called "the first-fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv. 20). Bucherius has examined this subject with his usual learning, and fixes the Paschal limits for Nisan 14 at March 18th and April 16th. If this be correct, we have the remarkable fact, that in the year of our Lord's crucifixion the passover fell on the earliest day allowed by the national usage; agreeing with the intimation that "it was cold" (John xviii. 11), and securing providentially the fulfilment of the prophecy that our Saviour's body "should not see corruption" (Ps. xvi. 10).

There is a second Table drawn out by Professor Airy, shewing the true and mean times of the moon's *visibility* for the same years. But, as David said, "*to-morrow* is the new moon," it is plain that he foresaw the change by computation. The Professor also observes, that at the Passover—and *pari ratione* at the feasts of Pentecost and Tabernacles—"large bodies of people were collected, and this could only be done by previous arrangement, or by *prediction* of the day;" and that they must have had "something like almanacs coming into use the beginning of the year or the year preceding," perhaps at the feast of Tabernacles, six months before. The Jews who came from beyond the Euphrates to attend the festivals at Jerusalem took four months to travel (Philo, *De Legatione*, 1023; Josephus, *Antiq.*, iii., xv. 3). The foreign Jews mentioned Acts ii. 9—11, and Paul going up from Ephesus to the Pentecost (comp. Acts xviii. 21; and xx. 16), must have known the time long before. Moreover, observations of the moon's *phasis* would be very precarious from the uncertainties of the weather. The Jewish writers, indeed, say that the Sanhedrim received testimony as to the moon's *phasis*, and even sent trusty persons to high mountains to take accurate observations of the moon; but this was probably designed to instruct the computers in preparing the next almanac.

According to my view then, our blessed Lord, following an ancient custom which recognized two equally orthodox times for the observance of the passover, killed his lamb on Thursday afternoon, March 17th, A.D. 29, and ate it the same evening after sunset; and was crucified on Friday, March 18th, expiring "between the two evenings" as "our passover" (1 Cor. v. 7), when the nation were killing their Paschal lambs, *Coss. duobus Geminis*, xv. Cal. April.

The foregoing solution of the vexed question rests on its own basis; but it is so happily confirmed by historical and astronomical concurrences, that I presume to offer it to the consideration of your readers with some degree of confidence.

*St. Stephen's, Coleman Street,
November 24th, 1862.*

JOSIAH PRATT.

As an old contributor to the *J. S. L.*, I beg to offer some views that may be regarded as to a certain extent *new*, in reference to the chronology of the last passover; and, therefore, to put in a claim to your attention, now that you have resolved to close the discussion, unless something that is new can be brought forward.

The only real difficulty appears to me to lie in the words of St. John, *ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ Πάσχα*, *that they might eat the passover*. But the words of St. Luke (xxii. 1) *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, ἡ λεγομένη Πάσχα*, *the feast of unleavened bread called the passover*, are, in the opinion of many able Biblical critics who have written on the subject, a sufficient explanation of the words of St. John. I am inclined to agree with those critics.

But as your correspondents who have been carrying on a controversy on this subject are led, on both sides, to understand St. John's words as used in reference to the *eating of the Paschal lamb*, I am justified in advancing the statement that, allowing their interpretation to be correct, both our Lord and his enemies may yet have partaken of the Paschal lamb, within the somewhat lengthened period (nearly twelve hours, or more) in which the Jewish law ordained that this required to be done. All the hours of the night—all the four watches, embracing the evening, the midnight, the cock-crowing, and the morning—were hours in which it was lawful for the Jews to partake of the Paschal lamb. We speak of the limits within which it was lawful to do so. We do not assume that a period so long as twelve hours, or even so long as six, was required for the purpose. Still the period may have been longer, in many cases, than is usually supposed. It is probable that the Jews remained long awake on the passover night. Perhaps they always watched until midnight had passed by. This custom, if it were a custom, would give additional meaning to the words of Jesus, when he urged on his disciples the propriety of watching and prayer at the late hour at which the betrayer was expected by our Lord to come in search of him. We read in Exod. xii. 42, that the passover night was "a night much to be observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt. This is that night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations." It was at the mysterious hour of midnight that all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon, and all the first-born of cattle, were smitten with the swift stroke of death. The blood of the lamb, sprinkled on the two side-posts, and on the lintel (the anticipation of the sign of the cross), guarded every home in which the Israelites dwelt. And is it not a

most natural supposition, that on the passover night, in succeeding ages, many pious families of the Jews were accustomed to watch until at least the midnight hour had passed by ?

Whether they watched for a still longer period, or usually retired to rest soon after midnight, on the night of the passover, of this we are assured by the Scriptures that nothing of the Paschal lamb was permitted to remain till next morning; and that if any did remain until the morning, it was imperative on those concerned to see that this remainder was all consumed by fire. The hours for the complete observance of the holy rites of the passover night were, therefore, *not literally ended* until all the watches of the night were ended, and the hours of the day begun. The servants or slaves of opulent Jews would have to eat of the Paschal lamb as well as their masters; and after all had partaken, it required to be carefully seen either that no fragment remained uneaten, or that whatever did remain until the morning was consumed by fire.

Now, let us endeavour to recall what occurred on the night in which our Lord was betrayed. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, lead us to think that Christ partook of that passover which he sent his disciples to prepare; and nowhere is it said that he did not eat of this passover. There is no proof of any introductory meal on the night previous to the night of the passover being ever observed by the Jews. The feast began with the slaying of the Paschal victim close at the opening of the first day of unleavened bread. Our Saviour had accomplished his desire, and seemed to breathe free, when, in spite of the vigilance of his foes, he had reached the appointed hour for not only eating of the Jewish passover, but also instituting the Christian passover, of which the older ceremonial was merely the type. We must quote the words of Luke; for some of your correspondents appear to write in complete oblivion of them (xxii. 8). "And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat. And they say unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare? And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he entereth in. And ye shall say unto the good man of the house,^a The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest-chamber *where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?* And he shall shew you a large upper room furnished: there make ready. And they went, and found as he had said unto them: *and they made ready the passover.* And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, *With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer:* for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup and gave thanks." . . . It was evening when they sat down. It was night

^a Two observations are suggested by this proceeding of our Lord's. 1. Judas was prevented from knowing beforehand who the owner of the house was. 2. This house appears to have been at the eastern side of the city, and not far from Gethsemane.

when Judas went out. The last faint gleams of twilight had faded. He went into the *outer darkness* in more senses than one, with the strange words ringing in his ears; "That thou doest, do quickly."

How long a period elapsed before Judas again saw our Lord, at the hour of betrayal, cannot be affirmed with certainty; but it is probable that it was at midnight that the betrayal took place. The chief priests desired to lay hold of Jesus in the absence of the multitude. Judas might probably interrupt some of the priests in the midst of their observance of the passover, if they were not previously occupied partly by the services of the temple and partly by their plans for the apprehension of Jesus, to such an extent that their personal observance of the feast had not properly speaking begun. The high priest and the chief priests had numerous duties at this particular period. Their purposes in reference to Jesus required to be rapidly developed into action, as soon as Judas gave them the opportunity they desired. Some of them may have been waiting for Judas early in the evening. They had to organize "a band of men and officers," to be sent under the guidance of Judas; they had to wait for the return of the band; they had to deliberate with Annas and Caiaphas successively, till the hour at which a consultation was held with the elders and scribes and the whole council. This consultation gave the final effect to the condemnation which had already been passed upon Jesus. The consultation was held *εὐθέως ἐπὶ τὸ πρωῒ* (Mark xvi. 1), which we may be warranted in translating, *close upon the morning watch*. Now we may be allowed to suppose that *the attention* of the chief priests, who were most active in securing our Lord's apprehension, *had been so completely occupied* that as yet they had not left themselves time enough to partake of the passover, or, at least, to go through all the rites connected with the eating of the passover? The fact that it was yet very early is an important one to note; for they still had some time—perhaps to the extent of two hours or more—in which to do what required to be done before the *hours of the day* commenced. By the hours of the day, we mean those hours that were divided from the watches of the night. And it is remarkable that St. John uses the very words *ἦν δὲ πρωῒ* in immediate connexion with the words that have occasioned so much controversy and speculation. St. John says, "Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early (or, it was the morning watch); and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover."

If they still had sufficient time to do so, the difficulty vanishes. Nothing requires to be explained. For the time when all the rites of the passover night required to be brought to a conclusion was the end of the morning watch. St. John relates that it was still very early, and that they did not enter into the *prætorium* (which may have been either in the tower of Antonia, or in the palace built by the elder Herod, both of which were close to the temple), but waited—it may be almost within the very precincts of the temple—till Pilate came out to them. Perhaps they felt that they could still hurry to a close the civil trial and condemnation, as they had already hurried through the eccle-

siastical one, before the circumstances were known over the city, and before it was too late to finish the observance of every rite connected with the eating of the Paschal lamb.

In such a case, how startling the prophetic and poetical justice in the antitype being brought into this connexion with the type.—*The chief priests cannot get the Jewish passover night properly observed, by reason of their anxiety to secure that "Christ our passover" may be sacrificed!*

But, supposing they were too late to do all they intended to do, before the hours of the day began, what then? The chief priests were sometimes unusually delayed, as we find from the records of the passovers in Hezekiah's time and in Josiah's, owing to the amount of work required of them; and it may have been quite lawful for the priests to observe the final rites at a period much later than others, and to do so in a more summary manner than would have been tolerated in any of the people.

It is well however, after all, to bear in mind that *peace-offerings*, many of which would be offered in the course of the feast of the passover, demanded a scrupulous attention, as great as the passover demanded, in all who were to partake of them (Lev. vii. 20, 21). The priests had a special portion in the peace-offerings. And there would be no straining of the sense, if we were to understand the words of St. John as explicable on this hypothesis—that previous to eating of the festal victims during the seven days of the passover feast, a peculiar care was required lest the priests should incur any ceremonial defilement. And this hypothesis, indeed, almost bends with that which we mentioned at the outset, as approved of by many able men in various ages of the church.

J. L. BLAKE.

Stobo, Peeblesshire, December 3, 1862.

THE NEWTONIAN THEORY OF THE BOOKS OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

YOUR correspondent, "Constant Reader" (*J. S. L.*, Oct. 1862, p. 143), has now brought to a close his comments on the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, in refutation, as he supposes, of the views entertained by Sir Isaac Newton, "behind whose ample shield," as he observes, I have maintained, and I do still maintain, that "Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah, the Tirshatha, who was living in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 433, also sealed the covenant with those priests who came up with Zerubbabel from Babylon to Jerusalem:" and as a reasonable inference from thence, that Nehemiah the Tirshatha was possibly, not certainly, the same Nehemiah who came up with Zerubbabel, Jeshua, Mordecai, and others, in the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes, about the year B.C. 493, to build the sanctuary or temple of Jerusalem.

Your correspondent has no doubt put forth his whole strength in his endeavour to crush the argument of the great mathematician which

has led to these conclusions: and in proportion to the failure of his effort—for I think it will appear that he has signally failed—so will the inference be in favour of the probability of Newton's reasoning.

In referring to your correspondent, I shall in future take the liberty of withdrawing his veil of anonymous disguise, and speak of him as the Rev. Mr. —, ^b of which he cannot complain, considering the personal turn which he has given to his remarks. Besides which, he who enters the lists with Newton, and professes to look down upon him as "an ordinary man" in matters of history and chronology, and who ventures to speak of his ideas as "baseless notions" and "wretched hallucinations," must himself be indeed a man of no ordinary ability and pretention, and one therefore who should not be ashamed of appearing in his true light before the world.

Let us again state the question at issue between Newton and Mr. —, in the words of the great philosopher himself. They are words, if true, of the deepest importance, both as affecting the whole range of Bible chronology, and also with reference to his own reputation for almost superhuman sagacity. "The history of the Jews under Zerubabel," writes Newton, "is contained partly in the three first chapters of Ezra, and five first verses of the fourth: and partly in the book of Nehemiah, from the fifth verse of the seventh chapter to the ninth verse of the twelfth: for Nehemiah copied all this out of the chronicles of the Jews written before his days, as may appear from reading the place, and considering that the priests and Levites who sealed the covenant on the 24th day of the seventh month (Nehem. x.) were the very same with those who returned from captivity in the first year of Cyrus (Nehem. xii.), and that all those who returned sealed it." The feast of tabernacles, we know, was also kept by the same priests in the same month. Thus Newton identifies "the congregation of them which were come again out of the captivity" (Nehem. viii. 17) with the "children of the province that went up out of the captivity (Nehem. vii. 6, and Ezra ii. 1), and the feast of tabernacles, Nehem. viii. 15, 17, with the feast of tabernacles, Ezra iii. 3, 4, 6. Mr. — denies both Newton's historical arrangement of the books and the inferences.

"A plain statement," writes Mr. —, "should put down this chimerical notion, *i. e.*, if it will consent to be put down; for these notions are generally very tenacious of life, and are burlesque resemblances of those Englishmen of whom Napoleon said they never knew when they were beaten." Mr. — therefore commences his plain statement, with great confidence, by shewing that at the feast of tabernacles, recorded in the book of Nehemiah, "the people went forth, and brought them (branches) and made themselves booths, every man upon the roof of his own house, and in *the courts of the house of God, and in the street of the water-gate, and in the street of the gate of Ephraim.*" Moreover, he remarks that Ezra was present, and adds: "Hence we conclude that this celebration of the feast of tabernacles must have occurred, not only after the completion of the *temple* in the sixth year

^b Our correspondent is wrong in his conjecture.—ED. J. S. L.

of Darius Hystaspes (Ezra vi. 15), not only after the arrival of Ezra at Jerusalem in the seventh year of Artaxerxes (B.C. 457), *but also after that complete restoration of the city wall and gates described in the third chapter of Nehemiah,*" and especially in verses 13, 14, and 15 of that chapter (B.C. 445—4).

I have already disposed of that part of the argument which rests upon the words "house of God," shewing that these words do not necessarily imply that the *temple* or sanctuary had at this time been rebuilt, but that they have reference to that interval of time between the laying the foundations of the *house of God* in the time of Cyrus, and the laying the foundations of the *temple* in the time of Darius; and with regard to the presence of Ezra at Jerusalem with Nehemiah before the seventh of Artaxerxes, there is no insuperable difficulty in supposing that, like Mordecai, he came to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel, and like Mordecai soon after returned to Susa as one of that embassy to the king mentioned by Josephus, of which Mordecai, the relative of queen Esther, then of extreme age, is mentioned as the leader, though Ezra as a young man, and then not an important character, is not named. It is the inference, drawn from the fact that a scene was enacted *before the water-gate and the gate of Ephraim*, that the gates of the city must at this time necessarily have been set up, which dwells in Mr. —'s mind as so decisive, and which seems more and more to grow upon him the more he ponders upon it. In the *J. S. L.*, October, 1862, p. 143, he again returns to this argument thus: "The mention of the two city gates (*i. e.* the water-gate and gate of Ephraim) in the sixteenth verse of this eighth chapter, especially when taken in connexion with the 'very great gladness,' *assists in shewing, beyond a doubt, that the disastrous state of things which had smitten Nehemiah to the heart had wholly passed away.*" "Who can reasonably doubt, that previous to this season of very great gladness," "*the desolate and ruined wall had been rebuilt, the city gates restored; and the national reproach triumphantly removed?*"

The additional make-weight here thrown in of the "very great gladness" does not require a moment's consideration. It must be obvious to every one that this unusual gladness is equally appropriate to the time of the laying of the foundations of the temple, where we have placed it, about which time the Jews are said to have shouted with joy, as to the time of the rebuilding of the wall. But with regard to the triumphant question, "Who can doubt that the desolate and ruined wall had been rebuilt, and *the city gates restored?*" we may firmly reply, who can be so shallow, and so devoid of common judgment, as to be imposed upon by this very empty argument, so pompously repeated? "That heart-smiting scene," observes Mr. —, "is described as still existing in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes (B.C. 445), by Nehemiah himself in the seventeenth verse of the second chapter. Now if the reader will take the trouble to turn to this chapter, and read verses 13 and 14, he will find that at the very time of this heart-smiting scene, when the gates of Jerusalem are spoken of as "burned with fire," and when no gates therefore were in existence, Nehemiah

“went out by night by the *gate of the valley*,” and then “went on to the *gate of the fountain*,” clearly establishing that the word “gate,” as used by Nehemiah, does *not* necessarily imply the presence of doors or bars, but merely expresses the gateway or opening through which he passed. If then, according to Mr. —’s logic, the mere mention of the water-gate and gate of Ephraim proves that the desolate and ruined wall had been rebuilt, the city gates restored, and the heart-smiting scene, occasioned by the absence of wall and gates, had passed away, what does the mention of the two other gates prove, according to the same logic? Perhaps Mr. — will kindly answer this question, if he has sufficient confidence in his argument to renew the subject. In the meanwhile the reader will be content to observe, that long after the time when Nehemiah passed through these gates or gateways, and even after the wall had been built, he himself informs us (chap. vi. 1.) that “at that time I had not set up the doors upon the gates.” Will Mr. — venture a third time to bring forward this favourite argument to prove that the city gates had been replaced, or will he retire in silence from the field, heart-smitten at the failure of this feeble attempt to refute the unanswerable argument of Newton, from the identity of the names of the priests who sealed the covenant with those who came up with Zerubbabel, that the scene before the water-gate and gate of Ephraim took place long before the building of the wall was commenced.

Mr. — proceeds to remark: “So the wall was finished on the twenty-fifth day of the month *Elul*, in fifty and two days” (Neh. vi. 15), “and *five days* after this memorable and victorious completion of the wall *and gates*, began the seventh month (*Tisri*), on the fifteenth and following days of which the feast of tabernacles was to be kept;” and on the *first day* of the seventh month (chap. viii. 2, 3), we find Ezra reading the book of the law in the street before the *water-gate*. The reader will observe that it is Mr. —, not Nehemiah, who asserts that the *gates* had now been set up. Nehemiah, in chap. vi., expressly informs us that there was an interval between the completion of the wall and the setting up of the gates, and that during this interval not less than five successive embassies were sent and returned between Samaria and Jerusalem, four of them conveying proposals from Sanballat to Nehemiah to meet in the plains of Ono, midway between Samaria and Jerusalem. Mr. — assumes that all these journeys, as also a proposal “afterwards” from Shemaiah, that Nehemiah should take refuge in the temple, as well as certain transactions with Noadiah and the other prophets, alluded to but not described in full, and also the setting up of seven pair of great city gates, took place in the interval between the completion of the wall and the first day of *Tisri*, that is, apparently in the course of five days, one of them possibly a Sabbath, leaving perhaps not more than four working days for all these proceedings.

That Nehemiah should have “builded the wall,” so that “no breach was left therein” (vi. 1), reinstating that which had been destroyed by the army of the Chaldeans, as well as the dilapidations of more than a hundred years, in the short space of fifty-two days, or, excluding

sabbaths, in the space of forty-five days, is a feat of such extraordinary energy as almost to strain our belief: and no pre-conceived theory, however tenacious of life, would, I presume, induce Mr. — to endeavour to curtail that period: but that, in addition to this, seven pair of great city gates, “with the beams thereof,” the timber for which was to be obtained from the keeper of the king’s forest (ii. 8), “and the locks thereof, and the bars thereof,” capable of withstanding the warlike attacks of surrounding enemies, should have been set up by the humble artificers of the half desolate city of Jerusalem, in the space of four or five days, is simply incredible. Mr. Kelk himself would hardly undertake the contract. So that, on the face of the history, it appears to be impossible that the first day of the month Tisri, on which Ezra read before the water-gate, could be the first of that month Tisri which immediately followed the month Elul, on the twenty-fifth day of which the wall was finished.

What Mr. — takes to be the history of between fifty and sixty days, is evidently merely a brief allusion to events which covered a period, of several years. The third chapter of Nehemiah is evidently written as a public memorial to be preserved of the patriotism of certain families and individuals on the memorable occasion of the restoration of the wall and gates of Jerusalem. The sixth chapter briefly marks the time when the wall had been finished, but when the city gates had not yet been set up. The seventh chapter expressly marks the time when the wall had been finished, and the gates had been set up, when Nehemiah gave his “brother Hanani and Hananiah, the ruler of the palace, charge over Jerusalem,” and is supposed by some to have returned to Susa. Josephus, who had other materials before him besides the present book of Nehemiah, so interprets the history: for he tells us that Nehemiah was engaged in the work “for two years and four months, for in so long a time was the wall built” (Jos., *Ant.*, xi. v. 8); and any careful reader, “at all accustomed to these inquiries,” will readily perceive that Nehemiah is not relating the history merely of a few weeks, from one single expression—“Yea, I continued in the work of this wall, neither bought we any land” (chap. v. 16). No one will be hardy enough to affirm that this abstinence from the acquisition of property so long as the work of the wall was going on, for which Nehemiah takes credit to himself, was an act of self-denial extending over not more than a few weeks. From all which it is quite clear that the reading of the law, and the feast of tabernacles in the month Tisri, and the sealing of the covenant by *the priests who came up with Zerubbabel*, took place, not as Mr. — assumes, during the governorship of Nehemiah, but as Sir Isaac Newton argues, about the time of the governorship of Zerubbabel.

Nevertheless we find Mr. — boldly proclaiming his extraordinary paradox—the *reductio ad absurdum* of his view of the book of Nehemiah—“that the congregation of them that were come again out of the captivity” who kept the feast of tabernacles, has no reference to those “children of the province who went up out of the captivity,” but “to their sons, and especially their grandsons, and great grandsons,”

who never having been in captivity, could not have come up again from thence. This amusing paradox still seems to grow in force and favour with its ingenious inventor, and is, no doubt, one of those notions which he describes as so tenacious of life, as not to consent to be put down by a plain statement.

Again, Newton's yet unanswered argument is, that the priests and Levites who sealed the covenant, chap. x., being identical with those who returned with Zerubbabel, chap. xii., the sealing must have taken place about the time of Zerubbabel. If it can also be shewn, that the list of priests who were present at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem contains but a small remnant of those named in chapters x. and xii., it will be an additional confirmation of Newton's inference, that the events referred to in those two chapters should be separated from the time of the building and dedication of the wall by many years. The following lists speak for themselves to that effect.

Those who returned with Zerubbabel, chap. xii. B.C. 493.	Those who sealed, chap. x. .	Those present at the dedication, chap. xii. B.C. 488.
Nehemiah	Nehemiah	Nehemiah
Seraiah	Seraiah	Eliashib
*	Azariah	Azariah
Jeremiah	Jeremiah	Jeremiah
Ezra	Ezra (Neh. viii.)	Ezra
*	Pashur	
Amariah	Amariah	
Malluch	Malchijah	Malchijah
Hattush	Hattush	
Shechaniah or Shebaniah	Shebaniah	
*	Malluch	
Rehum or Harim	Harim	
Meremoth	Meremoth	
Iddo	Obadiah or Obdia	
	Daniel	
Ginnetho	Ginnethon	
*	Baruch	
*	Meshullam	Meshullam
Abijah	Abijah	
Miamin	Mijamin	Miniamin
Maadiah	Maaziah	Maaseiah
Bilgah	Bilgai	
Shemaiah	Shemaiah	Shemaiah
Joiarib		Hoshaiah
Jedaiah		Judah
Sallu		Benjamin
Amok		Eliakim
Hilkiah		Michaiah
Jedaiah		Elioenai, Ezra x. 22.
		Zechariah
		Hananiah
		Maaseiah and Eliazar, Ezra x. 18.
		Uzzi
		Jehohanan
		Malchijah
		Elam
		Ezer

Mr. ———'s next argument runs thus. "Nehemiah presided as Tirshatha at the national sealing." "Nehemiah *did not become Tirshatha of Jerusalem* until the twentieth of Artaxerxes."—"Eliashib, the grandson of Jeshua, was high priest when Nehemiah *was made Tirshatha.*"—"Zerubbabel *presided as Tirshatha*^c at the completion and dedication of the second temple,"—"and Zerubbabel was not Tirshatha in B.C. 445, when Nehemiah, in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, *was made Tirshatha at Jerusalem.*" From whence it would appear, that if the national sealing took place while Zerubbabel was Tirshatha, there must have been two Tirshathas at the same time at Jerusalem, which is incredible.

Now this argument would be of some force if there was the slightest solidity in it. But it is really nothing more than what Mr. ——— would term "a wretched hallucination." There are no less than four errors in the above extracts, as marked with italics. Where did Mr. ——— discover that Nehemiah was made Tirshatha at Jerusalem in the twentieth of Artaxerxes? Nehemiah himself tells us that "he was appointed to be their governor," מִשְׁתָּרֵת, not Tirshatha, "from the twentieth year, even unto the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes," (v. 14.) And where did he discover that Zerubbabel presided as Tirshatha at any time? Darius, who had appointed Zerubbabel governor of Jerusalem, writes, "Let the governor of the Jews, מִשְׁתָּרֵת, not Tirshatha, and the elders of the Jews build this house of God in its place," (Ezra vi. 7.) Mr. ——— will find that he is arguing in a vicious circle. The title Tirshatha occurs nowhere in the Bible, except in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the meaning and derivation of the word is by no means certain. Sebastian Munster has, indeed, given a derivation from two Hebrew words, signifying to pour out wine, which was the peculiar office of Nehemiah as cupbearer to Artaxerxes, but this interpretation is not universally allowed. On the contrary, many, with Mr. ———, infer from the peculiar chronological arrangement of those very chapters in Nehemiah, the propriety of which is now under discussion, that the word Tirshatha must have signified governor; Mr. ——— must know that there is no other ground for this interpretation. When, therefore, by using the word Tirshatha in the sense of governor he seeks to prove the peculiar chronological arrangement of the chapters to be correct, he is simply begging the question.

He truly remarks that "chronology and history are neither mathematics nor natural philosophy, in which Newton earned his illustrious name;" and then, what with the story of the cat and the kitten, and Bishop Horsley's estimate of some parts of Newton's chronology, not specified, and the argument concerning the city gates, which were no gates, and the story of Zerubbabel the Tirshatha, who was no Tirshatha, having thus, as he supposes, reduced Sir Isaac to the dimensions of an ordinary man, he ventures at last to approach the one powerful argu-

^c "Constant Reader" writes to say he gives up the term Tirshatha as applied to Zerubbabel, and desires "*governor*" to be always supplied for it in such cases.—
ED. J. S. L.

ment of Newton, resting on the identity of the two lists of priests and Levites, etc. Now then is the time for the exhibition of his prowess in an encounter face to face with the mighty giant. But alas! the champion of modern Biblical chronology is nowhere to be found. He has disappeared from the field, and sheltering himself behind the reader, whom he coolly recommends, "by comparing the statement of Newton with the language of Nehemiah, to *judge for himself* concerning the accuracy of Newton's affirmation," turns his back upon the argument, with this single feeble and faltering remark: "In order to make it clear that the names in the one list are *the very same* with those in the other, he (Newton) identifies the following (*certainly not without apparent reason*),

Malluch	with	Malchijah.	Iddo	with	Obadiah or Obdia.
Rehum	,,	Harim.	Sherebiah	,,	Shebaniah.
Judah with Hodijah."					

Will Mr. — distinctly and openly deny the correctness of Newton's identifications? He appears to be too apprehensive of the certain rejoinder to do this, and thus leaves the field to his opponent. Newton's decisive argument, therefore, still remains unanswered, and, as far as regards Mr. —'s capabilities, appears to be unanswerable. Again he remarks, "Newton's only warrant for asserting that Zerubbabel and the returned Jews sealed a covenant in the first year of Cyrus is, that Nehemiah and the Jews of his day sealed a covenant in the twentieth of Artaxerxes." But Newton has nowhere asserted that Zerubbabel himself sealed the covenant, and to say that Nehemiah sealed in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, is begging the whole question. Mr. — has somewhere playfully remarked, "Is it not altogether in Sir Isaac's favour that he has such a determined partisan in your correspondent," referring to the writer. But will not the reader, whose judgment he has appealed to, feel inclined to remark that it *is altogether* in Sir Isaac's favour to have had such a determined opponent as Mr. — who with all his ability, which we are not at all inclined to underrate, and with the elaborate pains he has taken, has not succeeded in producing one single solid argument tending to shake the position of the great philosopher; and the peculiar position in which Mr. — is placed is this, that the higher his own talents are estimated, the greater will be the tendency towards this conclusion.

Mr. — it appears has at length discovered, what no one has disputed but himself, viz., that Newton, after shewing that Nehemiah according to the common reckoning of the reign of Cyrus must, on his theory, have lived to the incredible age of one hundred and twenty years and upwards, has *consciously* and *deliberately* left the books of Ezra and Nehemiah "encumbered with this insuperable difficulty," as we have affirmed; and concludes that Newton has, therefore, "on his own chronological principles greatly erred, in stating that 'the history of the Jews under Zerubbabel is contained partly in the book of Nehemiah.'" Now this reasoning is correct so far as it goes. But Mr. — has not taken into consideration the alternative of the possible correctness of

Newton's historical principle of arrangement. For if his historical arrangement of the disputed chapters of Nehemiah be correct, then must Newton have greatly erred, as we contend, in adhering to the common received reckoning of the reign of Cyrus, for which Mr. — is an advocate. The question at issue, therefore, still remains untouched by his discovery, and it yet remains to be decided, whether it is the chronological arrangement, or the historical arrangement of Newton, which is in fault.

We have already seen how utterly Mr. — has failed in his attempts to establish the latter alternative. On the other hand, he is well aware that for many years past we have argued that Newton, as well as all modern chronologists, are in error in adopting the common chronology of the reign of Cyrus drawn exclusively from the history of Herodotus, to the exclusion of the accounts given by Ctesias and Xenophon. At the same time we have remarked upon the tendency of Newton's reasoning to subvert this chronology, and upon the sagacity with which he has worked out three leading facts, which we venture to surmise will ultimately lead to some better arrangement of Persian chronology, both sacred and profane. He has, indeed, firmly adhered to these facts, but it must be admitted that he has not succeeded in reconciling them with the received system of dates. It would have been surprising if he had. The solution of the difficulty which we have suggested, and which is fairly deducible from Newton's data is, that Zerubbabel came to Jerusalem, *as Josephus relates*, to build the temple or sanctuary at Jerusalem in the first year of Darius, "what time he was set over the realm of the Chaldeans," the very year in fact in which Daniel had prayed that the sanctuary might be restored, that is to say, the year in which Darius had attained the age of sixty-two, which we know was the year B.C. 493, and about which time Darius, the son of Hystaspes, is first spoken of by Ezra as king of Assyria.

Now, if we suppose Nehemiah to have been thirty years of age when he came up with Zerubbabel, and, if not of the priesthood, which is improbable, he may have been many years younger, he would in the thirty-fifth year of Artaxerxes, B.C. 430, about which time he may have died, have been as much as ninety-three years of age. This is a great age, but not at all incredible, considering that Josephus has expressly recorded that he lived to a very great age. Mr. —, of course, feels himself called upon to notice this solution, and attempts to refute it; and having remarked that "as your correspondent is not very expert at seeing at once that which appears nearly self-evident to most readers, I have taken pains throughout to place things in as clear a light as I can," we now naturally expect that he will exhibit his most lucid style, and put forth his powers of perspicuity in meeting this suggestion by which it is proposed to solve all difficulties. But alas, at this critical point of the discussion, his reasoning becomes more confused than ever. His object, of course, is to prove that the great age of Nehemiah, involved in the proposed solution, would deprive it of all probability. He alludes to the "ludicrous and *crushing*" difficulty of supposing that the pious God-fearing Nehemiah, the priest as he supposes, "should

have retired from Jerusalem to live among the far distant heathen to the east of the Tigris," in total disregard of the fact, that both Mordecai and Zerubbabel, the companions of this same Nehemiah, had, according to Josephus, so returned and gone through this supposed crushing difficulty; and on the very same page proceeds to crush his own argument by endeavouring to prove that the pious God-fearing Nehemiah the Tirshatha actually returned from Jerusalem to live among the heathen for not less than twelve years.

Now the object of all this desperate inconsistency is to enable Mr. — to lengthen out the life of Nehemiah full twenty years beyond the time which has been allowed, even to the year B.C. 410, for which there is no sufficient warrant. In the first place, there is no reason for assuming that Nehemiah, the companion of Zerubbabel and Mordecai, was a priest more than they, and if so, he may have been not more than twenty-five years of age at the time of his first coming to Jerusalem; and if, with Prideaux, we allow five years more for the absence of Nehemiah from Jerusalem, and place his death in the fortieth instead of the thirty-fifth year of Artaxerxes, still the computed age of Nehemiah would remain ninety-three. But even this is not placing the argument in the light most favourable to the proposed suggestion. It is the opinion of Ussher and Petavius, on the authority of Thucydides and others, and an opinion gaining ground with modern chronologists (see Hengstenberg's *Christology*), that Artaxerxes Longimanus came to the throne about ten years earlier than the common date. We are inclined to agree with this view of the chronology, the effect of which would be to reduce the age of Nehemiah quite within ordinary compass; and it is not impossible that Nehemiah the companion of Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah, may have been distinct persons, and that the latter sealed the covenant some few years later than the time of the rebuilding of the temple. Mr. —'s objection to the proposed solution, therefore, has more the appearance of a flight of imagination than of solid argument.

Mr. — remarks, that our proposed arrangement of the reign of Cyrus is in defiance of "the almost universally allowed" arrangement of that reign. We are not aware of having made any exception, but have just repeated, what we have frequently before asserted, viz., that *all* modern chronologists have erred in too implicitly following Herodotus on this point. Like the celebrated author, however, who wrote *De omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*, Mr. — reminds us that there are some few modern chronologists whom he names, and for whom we have the greatest respect, which are not comprehended in the term *all*—and adds, in the style of his inimitable logic, that Mr. Bosanquet may think a little further consideration needful before he finally determines to reject what they have accepted; in other words, that being entirely opposed to the views of all combined, he will naturally yield his opinion to the favoured few.

But the mind grows weary of unravelling so much slender and impalpable reasoning, and the reader must have already grown weary in following us through the process. Neither the arguments of your

correspondent, nor his sarcasms, so applicable to himself, would have induced the writer to undergo the trouble of replying to his letter. But ever anxious for an opportunity to advance the subject he has at heart one single step, he has availed himself of the opportunity thus afforded of bringing to notice that the labours of the illustrious Newton tend towards the same conclusions as those at which he has arrived: and in quitting the subject, he is not without hope, that while the reputation of the great man who so earnestly and devoutly laboured in elucidating this and other most abstruse portions of the holy Scriptures may not have suffered at his hands, he may have also satisfied the reader that his reputation is in no great danger of receiving damage from the hands of such an opponent.

I. W. BOSANQUET.

NOTES ON EXCAVATED PRISONS; AND ON THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE ORIGIN OF MANKIND.

IN reply to the "Questions" of Mr. Sharpe, in the July number of the *J. S. L.* (p. 451), I beg to offer the following observations. If they do not prove altogether satisfactory, they may at least contribute to throw some light upon the passages quoted by Mr. Sharpe in support of his opinions.

I. Mr. Sharpe suggests that *pits or caverns* were anciently used in Palestine *as prisons*; and for this remark he owns himself to be indebted to Mr. Bonomi; who proves, from Egyptian paintings, that this was the practice of the land of Mitzrayim.

But the fact alluded to has long been familiar to all Oriental scholars, and needed no corroboration whatever from Egyptian sources. From the earliest ages, down to a very late period, the various *peuplades* of the Chamo-Semitic stock have familiarly used, as prisons, excavations originally made for very different purposes. To commence from a comparatively modern era, Pliny informs us (*Nat. Hist.*, lib. xviii., c. 30) that it was the custom in his time in Cappadocia, Thrace, Spain, and *Africa*, to bury corn for preservation in excavations (*in Scrobibus*) made for that purpose in the earth. Similar excavations are found among the Moors in Barbary, and are there called *Matmores*

مَطَامِير in the singular مَطْمُورَة. That these *Matmores* are used for prisons in Barbary, we learn from a very curious work, entitled *Relation de la captivité et liberté du Sieur Emanuel d'Aranda, jadis esclave à Alger*, published at Paris, 1665.

D'Aranda was taken from Algiers to Tetuan, for the purpose of being exchanged for a Turkish prisoner at Ceuta. On arriving at Tetuan, he was thrown for greater security, into the Matmore, which he describes in the following terms:—

"C'est une voute 30 pieds sous terre, divisée en trois parties. La plus grande partié peut estre environ longue de 28 pieds, et large de 24; les deux autres parties sont moindres. Et là estoient detenus ordinairement 170 esclaves Chrestiens. Cette prison n'a point d'autre lumiere que trois treilles qui sont en haut, au milieu

de la ruë : et à chacune des ces treilles il y a un crochet avec une corde : et quand de jour il y passe quelques Chrestiens, par charité ils portent aux pauvres esclaves de l'eau : ou bien s'ils ont de l'argent ils leur achètent quelque chose. Et cette corde, avec le crochet, est pour devaler ce que l'on a envie de donner aux pauvres.

"Tous ceux qui demeurent dans cette miserable prison sont contraints de coucher sur le pavé, si ce n'est qu'on leur permet de pendre des carres de cordes contre les murailles, comme l'on fait aux navires. Mais il y a tant de monde, et la place est si petite, que ces pauvres esclaves couchent empaquenez commes des harengs. Ce qui cause (principalement en Esté, à cause de la chaleur) tant de vermines, et tant d'autres calamitez, que l'on estime presque autant de peine d'estre là, que de ramer en Galere"—(pp. 76, 77).

From Barbary these *Matmores* were introduced by the Arabs into Spain. On the little hill at Grenada, called *El Monte de los Martires* they were, and I presume still are, to be seen in great numbers; and there is still a tradition that the Moors used them as prisons for the safe custody of their Christian slaves *at night*, after their enforced labours during the day.

It is singular that either from Spain or from Palestine, during the time of the Crusades, both the *name* and *use* of these Matmore-prisons appear to have passed into Scotland. Sir Walter Scott, describing Crichtoun Castle, in his poem of *Marmion*, introduces its dungeon-vault in these lines,—

"And, shuddering, still we may explore,
(Where oft whilome were captives pent)
The darkness of thy massy-more."

In a note on this passage, the poet observes:—

"The castle of Crichton has a dungeon vault, called the massy-more. The epithet, which is not uncommonly applied to the prisons of other old castles in Scotland, is of Saracenic origin. It occurs twice in the *Epistolæ Itinerariæ* of Tollius. 'Carcer subterraneus, sive, ut Mauri appellant, *Mazmorra*' (p. 147); and again, 'Coguntur omnes captivi sub noctem in ergastula subterranea, quæ Turcæ Algezerani vocant *Mazmorras*' (p. 243). The same word applies to the dungeons of the ancient Moorish prisons in Spain, and serves to shew from what nation the Gothic style of castle-building was originally derived."

To ascend from modern times to the patriarchal ages in the East,—we find the same custom, as to the use of subterranean prisons, even then subsisting among the people of the same stock and origin as the modern Arabs. Among the Abrahamic patriarchs and their descendants this species of prison was termed a *Bór* (בֹּר); a word formed from the root בָּרַךְ, to *dig*; and (as it is well known that there are strong analogies between the primitive Hebrew roots and the Teutonic), it is possible enough that בָּרַךְ may be merely the Teutonic *bohren*, or *bore*. *Bór* is used in Hebrew to signify *an excavation made by digging*, as a *ditch*, *pit*, or *artificial cavern*. From this are derived various secondary meanings according to the uses to which the *bór* was applied. These are (1) a cistern for holding rain water; (2) a *prison*; (3) a sepulchre.

From its use as a prison, בֵּית הַבּוֹר or בּוֹר (the *House of the Bór*) is treated by the Hebrew writers as equivalent to the various words signifying a *prison* in that language, as בֵּית הַמִּסְגֵּר, מִסְגֵּר, or בֵּית הַקֶּלָּא. (See Jer. xxxvii. 15, 16).

We find an *Egyptian prison* termed (in Exod. xii. 29) *the House of the Bôr*; so that Mr. Sharpe will perceive that the Biblical records corroborate in this respect the customs of Egypt, at least as much as they receive any elucidation from them. The pit into which Joseph was thrown by his brothers was a *bôr* (Gen. xxxvii. 24), and appears to have been originally used as a cistern for rain water. We are told that there was then *no water in it*. The texts (Zech. ix. 11, and Jer. xxxviii. 16) support the view that the prison-bôrs of Palestine were usually empty water-cisterns.

But though the point which Mr. Sharpe proposes to prove, appears to be really too clear to require any evidence whatever,—I am yet compelled to observe that, if evidence were wanting, the passage cited by him, would scarcely supply it. In support of his views, with regard to cavern-prisons, he quotes the text (Psalm lxiii. 19), of which he adopts the following translation:—

“ While they, who seek to destroy my life,
Will be thrown into pits in the earth;
They will be delivered into the power of the sword,
They will be the portion of jackals.”

But the phrase *בְּבִּירֵי הָאֲדָמָה* (which Mr. Sharpe translates “*pits in the earth*”) is more properly rendered (as he will find on referring to the *Thesaurus* of Gesenius, p. 1496) by “*Infima terræ,—Orcus.*” It is applied not to signify a *prison*, but, in the sterner sense, of the *abodes of the dead*, or, more literally, the *subterraneous abodes*. This is obvious from the two lines which follow, and which (however we may be inclined to translate them) evidently mean that the parties alluded to should *perish by the sword*, and become the *prey of the wild beasts of the desert*.

II. As to the theory that *Adam was not the father of the whole human race*, but only of a part of the inhabitants of the earth, I imagine it to be perfectly clear that it will derive no support from the text (Psalm xlix. 1, 2). A person, familiar with the usages of sacred poetry, would at once discern that the two expressions, upon which Mr. Sharpe relies (*בְּנֵי אָדָם* and *בְּנֵי אִשָּׁה*, “*the sons of Adam*,” and “*sons of a man*”) are explained by the words “*rich*” and “*poor*,” in the following line; and, therefore, that the former means the *sons of man in general* (of whom the greater part are, in all ages and countries, *poor*); and the latter the sons of men conspicuous for their *wealth* and *dignity*,—a phrase equivalent to the Spanish *Hidalgo*.

On this point I shall content myself with citing the authority of Gesenius, whose explanation of the passage accords (as it seems to me) with that which would intuitively occur to every Hebrew scholar.

“ *בְּנֵי אִשָּׁה*.—*Interdum ponitur, ἐμφατικῶς, de viris nobilibus, opp., בְּנֵי אָדָם*, Ps. xlix. 3; Prov. viii. 4.”

The passage, Deut. xxxii. 8 (as Mr. Sharpe appears to perceive) has really no weight. It seems perfectly certain that the words “*the nations*,” in the first line, and “*the sons of Adam*,” in the second, are used as words of equivalent signification.

As to the text, Gen. iv. 15 (from which we learn that Jehovah set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him), I would observe that there is here no implied anticipation of an *immediate* avenger of blood starting up. If we believe in the scriptural accounts of the longevity of the antediluvians, we may easily suppose (upon the principles I have endeavoured to establish in the last number of the *J. S. L.*, p. 376) that the world was well populated before the death of Cain; and supposing Cain to have lived 900 years, the hour of probable vengeance would appear sufficiently near, even if it should be deferred for 600 years. Time was not the same thing in antediluvian estimation which it is in our days.

The preceding passage may derive illustration from another which closely follows it, in which we are informed that Cain *built a city*, and called it after the name of his son Enoch, a passage (bye the by) of which the German critics, of the school to which Dr. Hupfeld belongs, have not failed to take advantage in support of their mythic theory. Those who, like myself, differ altogether from the critics of this school, and who, while admitting the value of their labours, believe they are wrong in their leading principles, may properly assume that Cain did not build his city until there existed a sufficient number of his own descendants to people it, an event certain to have arrived some centuries before his death.

I think, therefore, we must call for new evidence in support of the theory that *Adam was only one of various progenitors of the human race*.

15th July, 1862.

HENRY CROSSLEY.

THE HANDS OF THE SWORD.

WE are assured, in the letter of Q. (*J. S. L.* for last October, p. 177), that the exegesis of the 9th and 10th verses (or the 10th and 11th, as they are numbered in the Hebrew) of the sixty-third Psalm, "presents no special difficulty." I am afraid that, on the very face of Q.'s translation, the difficulties will appear to be greater than he anticipates. A translation into English from a foreign language, should be intelligible to a mere English reader. This, however, can scarcely be said to be the case, with the version proposed by Q.

As the passage quoted well merits a careful consideration, I propose to examine Q.'s version; 1, with respect to its *primâ facie* adequacy in producing a clear and intelligible meaning; 2, on some minor points in the version; and 3, as to the rendering, which he borrows from Gesenius, of the idiomatic phrase, "*The hands of a sword*." The last is, of course, the true *crux* of the passage; and, considering the mode in which it has puzzled translators, ancient and modern, it is an unexpected pleasure to hear it described as free from difficulty.

I. The Psalm (as appears from its title) was written by David in the desert of Judah, at the time when he was in concealment from the pur-

suit of Saul. The first portion of the Psalm consists of praises of Jehovah, professions of the writer's confidence in him, and acknowledgments of the support which he has received from him. In the ninth verse the sacred poet exclaims,—

“ My soul follows thee as if it were inseparable from thee,
Thy right hand sustains me.”

The tenth and eleventh verses, in the translation of Q., are as follows:—

“ And THESE seek my soul to destroy it,
THEY shall come to the lower parts of the earth ;
THEY shall deliver HIM into the power of the sword,
THEY shall be the portion of jackals (or foxes).”

To comprehend this phraseology is not very easy. We naturally ask, who is meant by the word “*these*” in the first line, and by “*they*” and “*him*” in the third. There is nothing in the preceding part of the Psalm to enable us to answer these questions.

To throw light upon this subject, we are obliged to have recourse to the original Hebrew; and then the more obvious difficulty vanishes. After *hémâm* (*these*), in the first line, there is unquestionably an ellipsis of the Hebrew word *asher* (*who*);—an ellipsis which Mr. Sharpe had supplied, and which Q. erroneously rejects. This ellipsis of the relative pronoun is of such constant occurrence, both in the Hebrew and Arabic, that every one familiar with those languages, supplies it, as a matter of course, whenever the context requires it. In the present case it *does* require it, and the sentence is unintelligible without it.

When we read the first two lines of Q.'s translation as follows,

“ And those who seek my soul to destroy it,
Shall come into the lower parts of the earth,”

one difficulty vanishes; but a new one arises in the third line. We inquire “What is meant by ‘*they*,’ the subject of the verb ‘*deliver*,’ and ‘*him*’ its object?” As easily would a mere English scholar answer this question, as a Coptic student would have hoped to decipher an Egyptian inscription, before the discoveries of Champollion le Jeune, the basely-treated and ill-requited Father of modern Egyptology.

We again refer to the Hebrew, and we are no longer puzzled to discover the proper *subject* and *object* of the verb of the sentence.

Yaggîru-hû (the verb in question, with its affix) is the third person plural, future tense, of the obsolete verb *nâgar* (to flow), in the causative form *Hiph'ûl*; in which its proper sense is *to pour out*. Its nominative case is the word “*men*,” understood; which is here used in the same indefinite sense as *man* in German, and *on* in French. This is so plain that I should have thought it unnecessary to point it out, if it had not been for the inadequate rendering of the verb by Q.; and for a still more ludicrous blunder, which occurs in our authorized translation of 2 Kings xix. 32. We there read, “And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians one hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when

they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses." The notion of men arising in the morning, and finding, to their astonishment, that they were all dead corpses, is worthy of a certain living professor of history, famous for blunders of equal extravagance. It is obvious that the proper translation would be, "And when [*men*] arose in the morning," [i.e., *when it was the usual time of rising in the morning*] behold, they [*the Assyrians*] were all dead corpses."

To return to *yaggiru-hú*.—The pronominal affix *hú*, which is the object of the verb, signifies literally *him*; but I imagine very few Hebrew scholars would translate it in this literal sense. The context clearly shews that it refers to the enemies of the Psalmist, who are represented in the first line as seeking to destroy him. It is, therefore, an instance of the singular number used for the plural. Now, nothing is more common than this enallage of number in Hebrew, both in prose and verse. This is a fact familiar to every old lady who reads her Bible with ordinary comprehension. She sees it plainly, from such texts as the following, from Deut. xxix., "*Ye stand this day, all of you, before Jehovah your God,—your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger, that is within thy camp,—that thou shouldest enter into a covenant,*" &c. A case of enallage, closely in point to elucidate *that* in the text before us, will be found in Prov. i. 11, 12.

There has been much learned discussion on the subject of these enallages; but (avoiding the mystification with which such questions are usually overloaded) we may reasonably conclude that they originally came into use to avoid the too frequent repetition of the same termination; and that (thus introduced almost from necessity, and to avoid an intolerable cacophony) they came, in process of time, to be considered as an ornament and beauty in composition. Hence it is that we find them frequently used, particularly in poetry, without the slightest necessity.

I may add, that when the singular is used, by enallage, for the plural, it appears to me that it is used in a *collective* sense, and not *distributively*. For the idea of Q., that "*Him*, in the third line, seems to mean *each of them*,"—I can perceive no foundation in the spirit or practice of Hebrew composition. *Yaggíru-hú*, therefore, should be translated, "[Men] shall pour out them," i. e., the enemies of the Psalmist.

But verbs thus used (with the indefinite nominative "*men*" understood) may be rendered in English, more elegantly, in the *passive* voice; in which case the object of the Hebrew verb becomes the nominative of the verb in the translation. Adopting this mode of translation, we should render *yaggíru-hú*, "*They* [the enemies of the Psalmist] *shall be poured out*." This plan is adopted in the Alexandrian version, where *yaggíru-hú* is rendered Παράδοθήσονται; which (setting aside the question, whether the Hebrew verb, in this case, signifies "*to deliver*" or "*to pour out*") correctly expresses the meaning of the original.

I cannot, therefore, thus far, perceive that the version of Q. would be satisfactory, either to a mere English reader, or to a sound Hebrew scholar. To the former I think it would appear obscure and unintelligible; to the latter, incorrect and inadequate.

II. I shall next proceed to some minor points in Q.'s translation.

To render the Hebrew word *naphsh-ŷ*, in the first line, by the English word "*soul*," appears objectionable. *Nephesh* (abstractedly from any context) may be rendered (amongst other meanings) either by *soul* or *life*, or (according to an idiom familiar to the Hebrew and Arabic) *self*. For the *soul* of the Psalmist (in the sense in which *we* should use the word), his enemies probably cared little. We must, therefore, understand the word *naphsh-ŷ* to mean, either *myself* as an intensitive mode of expressing the pronoun *me*,—or *my life*.

As both these renderings (combined with the idea of *destruction*) would amount to the same thing, either may be admitted; and we may translate the first line, indifferently, either—

“Those who lay in wait for *me* for my destruction,—or
Those who lay in wait for *my life* to destroy it.”

In the second line, as the context shews that the word *tachtiyōth* here means *hades*, we should best convey the full force of the word to an English reader, by translating it "*the regions of Death*."

In the last line, where we meet with the words *menāth shu'ālīm*, the context also enables us to decide that the word *shu'ālīm* here signifies *jackals*. Q. suggests, as an alternative meaning, the word "*foxes*;" which (taken abstractedly) would be an admissible meaning; but which is not applicable in the present case. The Psalmist predicts that the dead bodies of his enemies should become the prey of *shu'ālīm*. Now jackals habitually prey upon dead carcasses; foxes very rarely, and only in the absence of other food. Every traveller in the East can vouch for the industry, with which jackals disinter such dead bodies as are imperfectly secured from their ravenous researches.

It should also be observed that *menāth* (portion) is here used in the sense of *prey*; and that the latter rendering is preferable, as being more within the comprehension of the vulgar reader.

III. We come now to the third line, which requires something more than a cursory analysis.

In the phrase *higgir p. 'al yedey cherev* (which, in the ordinary sense of the words, would mean "*to pour any one upon the hands of the sword*,") every word has been the subject of such various renderings, in the ancient and modern translations, as might well induce a modern critic to pause before he declares it free from difficulty. Q. following implicitly the opinion of Gesenius, renders it "*to deliver any one into the power of the sword*." It is, therefore, with Gesenius that we have to deal, which is, of course, a very different thing from dealing with an ordinary Biblical critic. No one can respect the authority of that great scholar more than myself; but it will soon appear that this is not a case, where the ablest Orientalist could pretend to be infallible.

The expression is, of course, figurative, and seems to have been in familiar use with the Hebrew poets before, and in the early part of, the Babylonian captivity. Besides the passage in Psalms, now before us, it occurs in Jer. xviii. 21, and Ezek. xxxv. 5. But its true meaning

had evidently become lost soon after the spirit of prophecy and poetry had become extinct in Israel. This is obvious, on a reference to the Septuagint and Syriac versions, and the explanation of the Targumist; and what puzzled these ancient translators, was naturally an enigma to the mediæval Rabbins.

Let us take each of the words in order.

1. *Higgîr* (with reference to the precise phrase in question) is rendered by the Septuagint translators (in Jeremiah) "*to crowd together*," (in Psalms), "*to deliver*:"—in Ezekiel, the whole phrase is perverted into nonsense. The Syriac translator adopts the meaning "*to deliver*:" the Targumist prefers "*to cast down*." Our national version renders it (in Ezekiel) "*to shed*," (in Jeremiah) "*to pour out*:" in the Psalms, it rejects all attempt at a literal translation.

On these renderings we may observe, in general, that each translator has accommodated his version of the word *higgîr*, to what he imagined to be the force of the words '*al yedêy cherev*'; and that they seem to have had no other guide to direct, or mislead them, in their various translations.

2. '*Al* is rendered in the Septuagint εἰς:—by the mediæval Rabbins, Kimchi, and Jarchi, "*by*."

3. *Yedêy* is rendered literally "*hands*" (χεῖρας), by the Septuagint, which amounts to a mere confession of ignorance. The Syriac, for some unintelligible reason, renders it in the singular "*hand*." The Targumist, and the Rabbins, Kimchi, and Jarchi, also adopt the literal sense. Our English translation renders it freely by the word "*force*."

4. *Cherev* is usually understood to mean literally the sword; but the Targumist understands it to mean figuratively "*those who slay by the sword*."

After all this medley of discordant opinions, an Œdipus was required to solve the enigma, which had puzzled so many critics; and, accordingly, Gesenius came forward with a new explanation; which, from the respect due to his name, requires our best and most careful consideration. He assures us that the true sense of the word *higgîr*, before '*al yedey cherev*, is *detrusit*. This he supports by an appeal to the use of this word in Micah i. 6;—a passage which, in our authorized translation, is rendered as follows:—

"Therefore I will make Samaria as a heap of the field,
And as plantings in a vineyard;
And I will pour down (*higgarti*) the stones thereof into the valley;
And I will discover the foundations thereof."

The great lexicographer (who, perhaps, like many others of his class, was endowed with a genius more critical than poetical, and who might not always be inclined duly to appreciate the noble figures of Hebrew poetry) could discern no beauty or propriety, in the sublime idea of pouring down the stones of a whole city, like the waters of a cataract, into the valley at its feet. Bent, therefore, upon taming down the noblest poetry into the dullest prose, he emasculates the passage by substituting the idea of "*thrusting down*," for the figurative language of the original.

Believing Gesenius, in this case, to be in the wrong, I must acknowledge my preference for the sense adopted, for the preceding passage, in our national version; and I cannot consider the quotation from Micah as an authority for explaining the verb *higgîr* in the sense of *detrusit*.

Upon the same principles, I adhere to the ordinary meaning of *higgîr* in the passage from Psalms, now before us; and I should translate *yaggîru-hû*, by "*They* [the enemies of David] *shall be poured out.*" The meaning, of course, is "*their BLOOD shall be poured out;*" and in this sense the phrase was understood by our English translators, who have supplied the word "*blood*" in italics in the two passages in Jer. xviii. 21, and Ezek. xxxv. 5. They appear to have omitted it in Psalm xlix. 10, merely because, discarding in that verse any attempt at literality of translation, they give, in a very loose manner, what they believed to be the sense of the passage.

The expression "*to pour out their blood,*" would have appeared poetical enough to an European imagination; but Oriental poetry adopts a loftier flight. The inspired Psalmist does not halt in his course to adopt the literal phrases of prose narration. By an application equally bold and beautiful of the figure Synecdoche, he pours the guilty themselves, in indiscriminate confusion, upon the instrument which was sharpened for their destruction.

The remaining words of the phrase (*'al yedêy cherev*) are understood by Gesenius (when used *post verba tradendi*) to mean "*in potestatem gladii.*"

Their true meaning seems to me to be "*Upon the blade of the sword.*" As the *mouth* of a sword (*pî cherev*) is used in Hebrew to signify its *edge*, so I apprehend that the "*hands of a sword*" (*yedêy cherev*) mean simply its *blade*.

It may be proper to observe that, in the Oriental languages, the use, or abuse, of the figures of speech, is carried to an extent rarely to be met with in the languages of Europe. It happens commonly, in all languages, that to the primitive meaning of a word, a figurative sense becomes attached in common parlance, and that upon this figurative sense another (springing from it) is superadded, and upon the second occasionally a third. But, in this mode of heaping figure upon figure, the Chamo-Semitic languages surpass most others. They carry this exercise of the imagination to the bounds of extravagance; and this will, in some measure, assist us in accounting for that enormous quantity of heterogeneous meanings, which are frequently attached to one and the same Arabic, or even Hebrew, word. The oriental imagination delights in these more recondite meanings of a word, and often prefers their use as a peculiar elegance.

After this explanation (addressed to mere English readers), I may proceed with my remarks.

From "*hand*" (the primitive meaning of the Hebrew word *yad*) sprung, in the way I have mentioned, many secondary meanings, among which one of the most familiar is that of *side*,—a meaning equally applicable in English; as "*on the right hand or left hand,*" for the right, or left side. Now the *sides of a sword* (used by Synecdoche for

the *whole blade*) is a well-known expression in oriental poetry, an example of which we find in the following line of a poem familiar to every Arabic scholar:—

“Ka-'s-saifi 'orriya matnâ-ho min al-khilali.”

(“Like a *sword*, whose *sides* are denuded of the ornamental coverings of its scabbard).)

Here it is to be remarked that *matnâni* signifies the *two loins* (with the flesh and sinews), like the Hebrew *mathnayim*. The *loins* are used figuratively by the Arabian poet for the *whole sides* (as we are told by the scholiast), and the *sides* for the *whole blade*.

Observing (from this example) how the oriental poets deal with figures, we need not be surprized that *yad* (in the sense of *side*) should be used for the *blade of a sword*, and should thus form a sister idiom to that strange Hebraism, the *mouth* of a sword.

IV. To sum up the result of the preceding remarks, I should propose (as a correction of Q.'s translation of the tenth and eleventh verses of the sixty-third Psalm) to adopt the following, adding (to make the sense more perspicuous) the preceding verse.—

9. My soul follows thee, as if it were inseparable from thee :
Thy right hand sustains me.
10. And those, who lay in wait for me, for my destruction,
Shall enter into the regions of Death.
11. Their blood shall be poured out upon the blade of the sword :
They shall become the prey of jackals.

31st Oct. 1862.

HENRY CROSSLEY.

P.S. I ought, perhaps, to observe, that my letter, entitled “*Excavated Prisons*,” etc., was written and forwarded before the appearance of the last October number; so that, at the time of writing it, I had had no opportunity of perusing the two letters of Q. and J. H.

FORTIFIED CONVENTS.

As Mr. Sharpe's *History of Egypt* has (I believe) reached a fourth edition, I should wish to point out what appears to me an error of some importance in that popular work, especially as it has been already adopted into another work at least equally popular.

In the Roman period, and under the reign of Justinian, Mr. Sharpe has the following passage:—

“As the forces of Constantinople were driven back by the victorious armies of the *Persians*, they lost, among other fortresses, the capital of Arabia Nabatæa, that curious rocky fastness that well deserved the name of *Petra*, and which had been garrisoned by Romans from the reign of Trajan to that of Valens. But the losses of an empire are seldom recorded with the same accuracy as their conquests; and the fall of *Petra* is not mentioned by the historians. On the loss of *Petra* it became necessary to fortify a new frontier post on the Egyptian side of the Elanitic gulf. Justinian then built the fortified monastery on Mount Sinai, to guard the only pass by which Egypt could be entered without the help of a fleet; and when it was found to

he commanded by one of the higher points of the mountain, he *beheaded the engineer* who built it, and remedied the fault, as far as it could be done, by a small fortress on the higher ground. This monastery was held by the Egyptians, and maintained out of the Egyptian taxes. *In history we are so often misled by names*, and facts are so often hid behind words, that it is sometimes useful to recall the attention to what is passing. When the Egyptians were formerly masters of their own country, before the Persian and Greek conquests, they were governed by a race of priests, and the temples were their only fortresses. The temples of Thebes were the citadels of the capital, and the temples of Elephantine guarded the frontier. So now, when the military prefect is too weak to make himself obeyed, the emperor tries to govern through means of the Christian priesthood; and, to complete the resemblance, when he is forced to get the Egyptians to defend their own frontier, *he builds a monastery, and garrisons it with monks.*"

I should feel not a little obliged to Mr. Sharpe, if he would produce the authorities upon which he supposes that Petra became lost to the Romans in the reign of Justinian; and if he would shew in what manner this loss was connected with the victories gained by the Persians. Mr. Sharpe appears to rely upon the annals of Eutychius, but the medical patriarch of Alexandria (who was *born* about two centuries after the *death* of Justinian) would be a poor authority upon such a subject. Having a *contemporary authority* before us,—that of *Procopius*,—I do not see why we should be asked to rely upon the legendary narratives of Eutychius, which savour so strongly of monkish infirmity. It is quite certain that *the Persian armies never*, at any period *in the reign of Justinian*, penetrated to *the south of Apamea*, on the Orontes, a city which is about *four hundred miles north of Petra*. The node in which Mr. Sharpe's authorities were misled, is at once instructive and ridiculous. A city named *Petra* was actually taken by Khosru Nushirvan, in the reign of Justinian (Procopius, *Persic.*, ii. 17). Here then the case might appear to be proved. Not at all:—we are still a thousand miles from the mark!!! The city taken by the just Nushirvan, was (unfortunately) *Petra in Colchis*, a place at least a thousand miles distant from *Petra of the Nabatæans*. The Colchian Petra was besieged and taken by Chosroes, in the year following his invasion of Syria; so that it is not surprising if the two places should have been confounded by the uncritical credulity of the ecclesiastical historians.

But supposing the Nabatæan Petra to have *fallen* in the time of Justinian (a fact which we may justly treat as mythical, until we receive further evidence from Mr. Sharpe), still I contend that there is not the slightest ground for Mr. Sharpe's opinion; that the convent of the transfiguration was built by Justinian *as a frontier fortress*, and *garrisoned by monks*. On this point, the only reliable authority is that of Procopius, who informs us (*De Ædific.*, lib. v., c. 8) that Justinian built a chapel for the monks of Mount Sinai, and that this chapel was not built on the summit of the mountain, because no one could pass the night on that eminent but dangerous post, on account of the supernatural noises which were heard there. He adds that Justinian built a fortress *at the foot of the mountain*; and that he *put in it a strong garrison* to prevent the incursions of the Saracen tribes.

Here we have a clear and intelligible narrative; and we can discern

the whole train of the affair. The monks were annoyed by the incursions of the predatory Nabatæans: they applied to Justinian to secure them against the attacks of these hornets of the desert; and the imperial hypocrite agreed to erect for them a fortified convent. Deeming the sanctity of the mountain to be peculiarly resident in its summit, the decorous husband of the chaste Theodora proposed to the deputies of the monks that their convent should be built upon the very peak of the pretended Sinai. The monks, however, had their own reasons for not rejoicing in the imperial suggestion. The summit of Jebel Musa is covered with snow during a part of the winter; and even in the midst of summer, the nights are piercingly cold on this elevated site. *These* were reasons which could not be alleged by men who made a profession of self-denial: the wretched men, therefore, seem to have assured the emperor that the summit was perfectly uninhabitable from the hideous howlings of nocturnal demons; and as this response seemed exceedingly rational to Justinian, the great edificator complied with their suggestions, and adopted the site which his suppliants preferred—a pleasant, sheltered, and well-watered spot; where, in their own gardens, they might, by the labour of their own hands, raise fruits to rival those of Damascus or Shiraz;—a delicious and dreamy region of romance as ever was conjured up by the portentous fancy of a Canterbury canon.

The fortress was erected, *not* (as Mr. Sharpe states) *on* the mountain, but (as Procopius tells us, and as we know the fact to be) at the mountain foot,—(*i. e.*) at the foot of the monkish Horeb; which may, in a general way of speaking, be termed also the foot of the pseudo-Sinai.

The *large garrison* (of which Procopius speaks) was evidently of *soldiers* (who were afterwards withdrawn in the darker days of the empire);—and they were intended *not* for the *protection of Egypt* (a most incomprehensible idea)! but as a check either on the Nomades of the desert, or on the Nabatæans of Paran,—the actual perpetrators of those “*inscriptions*,” which have amazed and amused the world in our own days.

As for the story of the *beheaded architect* (which is totally inconsistent with the narrative of Procopius), we may feel assured that it is nothing more than the monkish legend of a long subsequent age.

Mr. Sharpe’s theory, therefore, as to the uses to which the convent of the transfiguration was destined by Justinian, seems to be proved to be destitute of any historic foundation.—1. Petra had *not* fallen *before the Persian arms*; and we have no historic evidence that it had fallen *at all*. 2. Procopius assures us that the fortress was erected *for the security of the monks*; and we have independent historic evidence of the necessity of such a fortress for their protection.

But if history upon this subject were a blank, and we were to debate the question merely upon conjecture,—still we should be puzzled to comprehend how the convent of the transfiguration could ever have been intended as a *frontier fortress*, since it is perfectly certain that it is *neither upon, nor even near, any frontier whatever*. Far removed from all the routes by which Egypt could be approached,—buried as it

(*extra orbem*) in an inaccessible desert,—an army of two hundred thousand men might have crossed the peninsula from Aila to Arsinoe (or Akaba to Suez), before the monks of St. Catherine could have received news of its approach.

If Justinian's policy had really been as extraordinary as Mr. Sharpe presents it, an excellent opportunity occurred of testing its utility at seventy-six years after the invasion of Syria by Khosru Nushir-

The armies of the grandson of that king, Khosru Parviz, actually invaded Egypt about A.D. 616. What did the monks of St. Catherine on this occasion? Of what utility was the *frontier fortress*? Eutychius (I am afraid) relates their exploits! Like Baal, when priests called upon him, they were either asleep, or on a journey! Justinianic policy was weighed in the balance of actual experience, and was found wanting. The marvellous scheme of defence proved to be as unreal as the fabric of a vision. The monastic fortress was of no more utility than an edifice of cards.

The apt reflection of Mr. Sharpe, that "*in history we are often misled by names*," is exemplified in the confusion into which he has incautiously fallen, of *Petra in Colchis* with *Petra of the Nabathæans*.

The error of Mr. Sharpe (as I have already observed) has extended its effect beyond his own history, and has been copied (on his authority) into the *Sinai and Palestine* of Professor Stanley, who adopts both the error and the theory of the historian of Egypt. The poetical style of Stanley falls so naturally into blank verse, that I trust he will excuse my quoting it in that shape.

"To build for them, as they desired, a convent
Which should be to them for a stronghold, was
A union of policy and religion,
Which exactly suited the sagacious emperor.
Petra was just lost ;
And there was now no point of defence against
The Arabian tribes, on the whole route between
Jerusalem and Memphis. Such a point
Might be furnished by the proposed fortress of
Sinai ; and as the old Pharaonic and even
Ptolemaic kings of Egypt had defended
Their frontiers 'gainst the tribes of the desert by
Fortified temples,
So the Byzantine emperor determined
To secure a safe transit through the desert by
A fortified convent."

(*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 52—Fifth Edition).

If the preceding remarks appear satisfactory to Mr. Sharpe, there are other points in his *History of Egypt* which merit reconsideration, to which I should propose to draw his attention.

5th July, 1862.

HENRY CROSSLEY.

THE "TE DEUM."

I FOR one have taken great interest in the controversy that has fitly enough found a place in your Journal respecting the "Te Deum," and I am only sorry that, for want of sufficient data, it is not likely to lead to any definite results. Permit me, however, to say a few words upon the subject. The great difficulty which has never yet been fairly encountered is in the first verse, "Te Deum laudamus." If this is an address to God, then surely it should have been "Deus;" if it is an address to Christ, the meaning is plain and applicable, but in that case we must omit verses 11—13 as spurious. That hymns were sung in the primitive Church to Christ *as God*, we know from Pliny's famous letter to Trajan, and from Eusebius, who quotes a writer to this effect: "Who knows not how many psalms and odes, *written* by faithful brethren *from the first* hymn, 'The Christ the Word of God,' ascribing to him Divinity (*θεολογούντες*)!" Odes, therefore, were committed to writing, in which the Christians glorified their founder as God. The whole emphasis is laid on our Lord's Divinity, as *θεολογούντες* comes last in the sentence.^o One of the charges brought against Paul of Samosata, at a council of Antioch, was that he had put a stop to hymns in honour of Christ, as modern and the compositions of modern men. At the council of Laodiceæ it was decreed that psalms composed by inexperienced men (*ἰδιωτικούς* laymen?) should not be said in the Church. Evidently, then, from the earliest times, our Lord was celebrated in numerous hymns as God; and why may the "Te Deum" not be one of such hymns? The first verse certainly leads us to suppose it was. But to proceed with the others. In the second we find the title, "Everlasting Father," applied to the Person, to whom the hymn is addressed. At first sight this seems to destroy the theory founded upon the first verse; but when we call to mind the natural eagerness of the early Christians to exalt our Lord and adorn Him with every name and epithet, hitherto applied to the Father, we need hardly wonder at even this term being employed in a relative sense, especially as it is one of the titles given to him in Isaiah. I readily admit that it is "opposed to the *usus loquendi* of Scripture and the Church," but it is applied to Christ at least once, and the author of the "Te Deum" might use it in the same signification, whatever that may be. H. P. does not, I presume, object to the title "Everlasting" being applied to our Lord, but simply to his being called "Father," which introduces, according to his idea, a confusion of Persons. Whether or not he may be called a Father in any sense will be best seen by quoting a few passages that do or seem to imply it. In ancient and modern times the sixty-third chapter of Isaiah has been referred to our Lord, and in verse 16 we read: "Doubtless thou art Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer; thy name is from everlasting."

Compare with this the commencement of Keble's hymn for Easter Monday:—

ⁿ *Eccl. Hist.*, v., 28.

^o Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vii., 30.

" Father to me thou art and Mother dear,
 And Brother too, kind Husband of my heart ;
 So speaks Andromache in boding fear,
 Ere from her last embrace her hero part ;
 So evermore, by Faith's undying glow,
 We own the crucified in weal or woe."

In the New Testament we should hardly expect to find the term applied to him who is emphatically the "Son of Man;" but once there is a near approach to it. St. John xii. 35, Jesus says to his disciples, "While ye have (the) light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light." By "light," the first and second time he means himself, and though the third *φωτός* has not the article, its proximity to the others suggests the idea of sonship with reference to "the true light." Again, in Heb. ii. 13, if we are to press the parallelism between our Lord and Isaiah, *τα παῖδια* must be interpreted to mean the children of our Lord, as some editors think, notwithstanding that it is contrary to the general Scripture analogy to represent us as *sons* of Christ. But these instances may be thought to be not at all to the point, or at the best ambiguous; I add, therefore, one or two quotations from the early fathers.

Clemens Romanus I. ad Cor., chap. xxii. : "And all these things faith in Christ confirms; for he, through the Holy Spirit, thus invites us, 'Come, children (*τέκνα*), hearken unto me' (Psalm xxxiii. 11); II. ad Cor., chap. i. : "Not knowing . . . what Jesus Christ endured to suffer for us . . . and what great kindnesses do we owe him? For he bestowed the light on us; *as a father he called us sons*;" Justin Martyr, *Dial. with Trypho the Jew*, chap. cxxiii. : "As therefore your whole race was called Jacob and Israel from that one Jacob, who was also surnamed Israel: so we too, who keep the commandments of Christ, as we are called Jacob and Israel and Judah and Joseph and David, so from Christ, *who begat* us unto God, we are called and are the true children of God;" chap. cxl. : "Hence Jacob, being himself also, as I said, a type of Christ, married the two handmaids of his two free wives, and begat sons from them to foreshew that Christ will receive even all those descendants of Canaan that are amongst the race of Japhet, equally with the free sons, and will consider them all *children* and co-heirs."

In this book, too, we find Christians spoken of as "quarried from the bowels of Christ," and the Church as the "daughter of Christ;" with the latter we may compare the song of Solomon, where she is called his spouse and sister.

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Pædagog*, i. 5.—Clement quotes Isaiah ix. 6, where the child that was to be born is said to be "Wonderful Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father;" and upon this he exclaims, "O the mighty God! O the perfect child! the Son in the Father, and the Father in the Son." In the Greek it is *Πατήρ αἰώνιος*, in the Latin *Pater æternus*; and Clement explains it evidently in accordance with the text, "I and my Father are one," and this, I imagine, might be one explanation, if it is predicated of Christ in the "Te Deum," in which case all confusion of persons is guarded against by the verse in

which he is called the "Son of the Father ;" for I do not think that these are necessarily contradictory, even when we suppose Christ to be spoken of in both verses. *Ibid.*, c. vii. : " But (to shew) that it was the Word who wrestled with Jacob and the Instructor of humanity, it says he asked him and said unto him, 'Tell me thy name : and he said, Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name ?' for he was keeping the new name for the new people, his children (τῷ νηπίῳ)." Clement's " Hymn to the Saviour : "

Χορὸς εἰρήνης,

Οἱ Χριστόγονοι,

Λαὸς σώφρων,

Ψάλλωμεν ὁμοῦ Θεὸν εἰρήνης,

Chorus pacis,

Christo geniti,

Populus modestus,

Psallamus simul Deum pacis.

On this hymn Bishop Bull remarks that it seems to be taken from the hymns used in the primitive Church, or at any rate made in imitation of them ; for without doubt, in the very times of the Apostles, the eternal and divine Majesty of the Son was celebrated by the faithful even in the public service. Other passages might be quoted to shew that the early writers could, without any confusion in their own minds, consider the Saviour as a Father in some sense in respect to his Church. However, after the rise of the heresy of Noetus, the language on this subject would become more guarded, and amongst later writers perhaps it would be difficult to find many instances. I will conclude my list of quotations with one from an English divine.

"The sons of God have God's own natural son, as a second Adam from heaven, whose *race and progeny* they are by spiritual and heavenly birth. God, therefore, loving eternally his Son, he must needs in him eternally have loved and preferred before all others them which are spiritually *and thence descended and sprung from him.*"

Again, setting all this aside there is another sense of πατήρ (pater), which at any rate is applicable here, and to Christ; I mean, that of Creator, Originator, as in Job xxxviii. 28, τίς ἐστὶν ὑετοῦ πατήρ; and James i. 17, τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων, which Alford explains as "the Father of the heavenly bodies." This meaning would be especially applicable to Christ, who is frequently spoken of as the Creator; and the earth may well worship him who framed it. The Sanctus may be applied to Christ, and is so in hymn xxxvii., vol. i., of Daniel's *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, which is remarkably like the "Te Deum" in some respects, and appears to have been mainly copied from it. With regard to verses 11—13, as "Lamed" points out, I think it extremely possible and not improbable that they are interpolated. In a "hymnus matutinus," as given by Ussher, I find—

1. Κύριε υἱὲ μονογενές.

3. Καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.

2. Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ.

4. Κύριε ὁ Θεός, κ.τ.λ.

But in the Latin there is no equivalent for the third line, and Bunsen too omits the line from his restoration of the Greek text. This line then I infer has been introduced by some copyist to include the third Person of the Trinity. Why may not the "Te Deum" have met with the like treatment? Even though no trace of interpolation may

be found in extant copies, it is not impossible. But we are told that all the nine preceding verses are incomplete, as to sense, without the four following ones, and that it is **UNGRAMMATICAL** to leave off at verse 10. Is it ungrammatical in the Latin or English? I allow that "te confiteor" may not be found in good classical authors, but is it on that account to be considered ungrammatical in an ecclesiastical writer? What says the Vulgate? In St. Matt. x. 32, *omnis ergo qui confitebitur me coram hominibus, confitebor et ego eum*; "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess (acknowledge) me before men, him will I also confess (acknowledge)." So also St. Luke xii. 8; Romans x. 9; Rev. iii. 5. St. John says, "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God." A confession then of the Divinity of Christ was the test of true belief: and we may expect to find it in ancient hymns. With respect to the internal evidence to be derived from the hymn itself opinions differ widely. Its unity has been vindicated by referring its structure to the plan of Scripture poetry. But were Greek hymns framed from Hebrew models? It is scarcely constructed according to the Greek idea of unity. There is certainly one point of resemblance between the "Morning Hymn" as given by Ussher, and the "Te Deum" as it now stands. In the former the first few verses are addressed to the Father, the following two to the Son, then comes one to the Holy Ghost, and the remainder refer to the Son, except that the Father is mentioned in the last. In the latter, the first eleven verses are addressed to the Father, the twelfth to the Son, the thirteenth to the Holy Ghost, and the remainder to the Son. Bunsen, as I said before, omits the mention of the Holy Ghost in the "Morning Hymn," and thus brings it far more into accordance with our ideas of unity. It begins with the angel's song of praise, which is amplified, and then our thoughts naturally turn to Christ, at whose mortal birth the first verses were sung. Whereas in the "Te Deum," "Lamed" and others consider that the versicles 11—13 appear to be out of place, and have been interpolated. And by omitting them, and taking the hymn to be addressed to our Lord, it is fully in accordance with our ideas of unity. The power and dignity of the Saviour as God is acknowledged and extolled, and then his great condescension as man, and lastly as God and man prayer is addressed to him. Internal evidence then in different minds leads to opposite results. Perhaps a careful analysis of ancient Greek hymns might help to solve the difficulty. On one side is the impossibility of construing "Te Deum laudamus" so as to reconcile it with the rest of the hymn: on the other, the improbability of the expression "as Father everlasting" being applied to the Son, and the fact that there is no trace of interpolation in any extant MSS. Who then shall cut the knot?^{*}

T.

^{*} Daniel Thes. Hymn. Vol. I., p. 24, hymn xvii.

"Votis vocemus te patrem,
Patrem potentis gratiæ

Patrem perennis gloriæ,
Culpam releget lubricam."

Later texts of course read *et* for *te*, but can the verse be construed as it stands? If it can, does it countenance the construction "Te Deum laudamus?"

"TE DEUM."

(Hymnorum veteris ecclesiæ xxvi., etc., ed. Jac. Grimm.)

"Te deum laudamus, Te dominum confitemur, Te æternum patrem Omnis terra veneratur.	Aperuisti credentibus Regna cœlorum
"Tibi omnes angeli, tibi cœli Et universæ potestates, Tibi cherubim et seraphim Incessabili voce proclamant :	"Tu ad dexteram dei sedes In gloria patris. Judex crederis esse venturus.
"Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus deus sabaoth ! Pleni sunt cœli et terra Magistate gloriæ tuæ.	"Te ergo quæsumus : Tuis famulis subveni, Quos pretioso sanguine redemisti,
"Te gloriosus apostolorum chorus, Te prophetarum laudabilis numerus, Te martyrum candidatus Laudat exercitus.	"Aeterna fac cum sanctis tuis Gloria munerari.
"Te per orbem terrarum Sancta confitetur ecclesia, Patrem immensæ majestatis, Venerandum tuum verum unicum filium, Sanctum quoque paracletum spiritum.	"Salvum fac populum tuum, domine, Et benedic hæreditati tuæ, Et rege eos et extolle illos Usque in æternum.
"Tu rex gloriæ Christus, Tu patris sempiternus es filius, Tu ad liberandum suscepisti hominem, Nec horruisti virginis uterum.	"Per singulos dies benedicimus te, Et laudamus nomen tuum In seculum et in seculum seculi.
"Tu devicto Mortis oculo	"Dignare, domine, die isto Sine peccato nos custodire.
	"Miserere nostri, domine, Miserere nostri.
	"Fiat misericordia tua super nos Quemadmodum speravimus in te.
	"In te, domine, speravi : Non confundar in æternum." ⁹

TRANSLATION OF THE MORNING HYMN IN THE
CODEX ALEXANDRINUS.

"Glory to God in the highest, And peace on earth, Good will among men ! We praise thee, We bless thee, We worship thee, We glorify thee, We give thanks to thee, On account of thy great glory, O Lord, king Super-celestial, God the Father Almighty,	O Lord, only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, And the Holy Spirit. Lord God. Lamb of God, Son of the Father, That takest away the sins of the world, Have mercy upon us, Thou that takest away the sins of the world, Have mercy upon us,
---	---

⁹ We print this copy of the "Te Deum" principally for the sake of the arrangement. It is taken from Wackernagel's *Deutsche Kirchenlied*, Stuttgart, 1841, where it is referred to Grimm.

Accept our prayer;
 Thou that sittest at the right hand
 of the Father,
 Have mercy upon us.
 Because thou only art holy,
 Thou only art the Lord,
 Jesus Christ,
 In the glory of God the Father. Amen.
 Day by day will I bless thee,
 And will praise thy name for ever,
 And for ever and ever.
 Vouchsafe,^r O Lord, that during
 this day also
 We may be kept without sin.
 Blessed art thou, O Lord, the God
 of our fathers,
 And praised and glorified thy
 name for ever. Amen.

Blessed art thou, O Lord, teach
 me thy judgments,
 Blessed art thou, O Lord, teach
 me thy judgments,
 Blessed art thou, O Lord, teach
 me thy judgments,
 Lord, thou hast been our refuge
 from generation to generation.
 I said, Lord, have mercy on me,
 Heal my soul, for I have sinned
 against thee
 Lord, to thee have I fled for refuge;
 Teach me to do thy will, for thou
 art my God.
 For with thee is the fountain of life;
 In thy light shall we see light.
 Extend thy mercy to those who
 know thee."

X. Y.

CRITICISM OF JOHN XIX. 10, 11.

THE *Table Talk* of the late S. T. Coleridge is a work that has had a very considerable circulation, although the works of Semler do not appear to be much known in this country. I remember drawing the attention of a person of considerable theological attainments to the interpretation of this passage put forward by Coleridge, and his answer was, that it could not be admitted for a moment, otherwise what would become of the proof, the divine right of kings, which depended upon it. Certainly the person in question afterwards left the Church of England for that of Rome, but such a remark, taken along with the silence of commentators, may fairly be cited to shew, that the interpretation of Semler and Coleridge has not had fair play, though, perhaps, the writer of the article used too strong an expression in calling the treatment it has met with, not a "pious fraud," but "little better than a pious fraud."

In other respects I think your correspondent J. B. is carried away by his indignation at the novelty to argue somewhat unfairly against the interpretation. "In no sense did Pilate receive his jurisdiction from *ὁ παράδιδούς*, whoever the latter was."

This is quite true of his jurisdiction in the abstract, but, as regards his jurisdiction over this or that criminal or supposed criminal, it may fairly be said, that he would not have had any, had not the criminal been brought before him. And it must be remembered that it is not said that his *ἐξουσία* was *δεδομένη* to him *ἄνωθεν*, but it was given him (*δεδομένον ἄνωθεν*) to have jurisdiction, *ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν*, which is a different thing. A judge has jurisdiction over all who are brought before him as criminals,

^r It is remarkable that the only portion of this hymn that coincides with the "Te Deum" is not in the oldest MSS. of the latter. Here, too, we have no such phenomena as those presented by the "Te Deum," which appears to begin to Christ as God, to go on to the Holy Trinity, and to return again to Christ.

and whoever thus brings a person before him causes him to have such jurisdiction in the particular case.

To take the illustration of Lord Canning and carry it out in accordance with the circumstance of the case under consideration, we must suppose that some Brahminical clique had brought before Lord Canning under the charge of rebellion some innocent person, whose bias in favour of Christianity had offended them. We must suppose that they had tried and condemned him on the charge of favouring Christianity, and had brought him before Lord Canning on the false charge of rebellion. We must also suppose, that Lord Canning had been half inclined to sacrifice him to the popular clamour, and had made upon his apparently contumacious silence the remark, that he had jurisdiction to release or condemn him. Would there be anything unnatural in an innocent person replying to his wavering judge under such circumstances. "You would have no jurisdiction over me at all, had it not been put into your hands from another quarter." Nor would any one—especially if these words had been accompanied by a significant look—have had any doubt, that their reference was not to Queen Victoria, from whom Lord Canning's *ἐξουσία* came, but to the Brahminical clique, from whom came the particular opportunity of exercising it. In our Lord's case the words following those thus interpreted amount to a semi-forgiveness of Pilate, and a deep condemnation of the Jewish priesthood. Is there anything vapid, impertinent, or silly in this? or anything wanting in "point and dignity?"

Whether Pilate knew or not that "he held his power from God and under God," he knew very well that he held it to "promote the ends of justice, to protect the oppressed and deliver the innocent." Witness the declaration of Festus (Acts xxv. 16): "It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die (*χαρίζεσθαι εἰς ἀπώλειαν*), before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him." Witness, too, the conduct of both Felix and Festus, who do not appear to have been a whit better even than Pilate, yet uniformly refused to gratify the Jews by the unjust destruction of Paul. No! the interpretation of *ἀνωθεν* in the sense "from heaven" would have had no sense intelligible to Pilate, but, as interpreted *ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνω βουλῆς* with Coleridge and Semler, would have been likely to produce just the effect upon Pilate's better nature, which it seems to have actually produced, as recorded in the next verse: "And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him." But if Pilate had understood "*ἀνωθεν* of God, and yet had known nothing of a pure and righteous God," how could he have followed the logical sequence of ideas indicated by *διὰ τοῦτο* in our Lord's speech? I hope J. B. will reconsider his arguments, especially remembering that "couldst have" is a mis-translation, and that *οὐκ ἂν εἶχες οὐδέμιαν ἐξουσίαν* simply states, that Pilate would not, as a simple matter of fact, have had any jurisdiction over our Lord, had it not been given to him to have such jurisdiction *ἀνωθεν*.

T. T.

BIBLE TRANSLATION.

I have no wish to take part in the interesting discussion now carried on in *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, on the desirability of a revision of the Authorized Version. But when it is attempted to raise a prejudice against such an undertaking by a reference to my translation, pointing to the rendering of a certain verse, to characterize this as bordering upon nonsense; and further, to draw the inference from it, that "To improve upon the Authorized Version by the conceits of the Talmud will not render the opponents of revision more favourable to it,"—I think I should do wrong were I not to solicit your permission to make a few remarks in the interest of the important question which the controversy seeks to ventilate.

Confining myself strictly to the points mentioned, I concede at once to "H. P." that "a sect or party likes to see its own views embedded in the Scripture text." I, as a Jew, am probably as little free from a Jewish, as were King James's translators from a Christian, bias. But in the particular instance referred to, I can assure your correspondent I was in my rendering as little guided by my bias as by conceits of the Talmud. In this particular rendering I was strictly guided by grammar and philology. To shew this I will place side by side the rendering of the Authorized Version of the verse under discussion and my own:—

PSALM ii. 12.

AUTHORIZED VERSION.

Kiss the Son, lest he be angry and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little: blessed are all they that put their trust in him.

MY TRANSLATION.

Kiss a pure one, lest he be angry, and ye wander from the way (not "its right way," as erroneously quoted by "H. P.") *for his wrath easily burneth: O happiness of them that trust in him.*

The differences between the two renderings occur in the phrase which, that they might be easily distinguished, I have marked to be printed in italics. Now every Hebraist knows that the Hebrew for "son" is בֶּן—a word which occurs innumerable times in the Bible, and, indeed, in the same Psalm, in the phrase (ver. 7): "Thou art my son." Had the text said נֶשֶׁךְ בֶּן, there could not have been the slightest doubt what the meaning is. The rendering must have been, "Kiss the son." But the Hebrew says נֶשֶׁךְ בִּי, employing a word which, in the signification of "son," is not Hebrew but Chaldee, which in the sense of "son," is only found for certain in one single passage in the Bible (Prov. xxxi. 2), and that, too, in a passage where a Chaldee form of a Hebrew word distinctly occurs (מֶלֶךְ for מַלְכָּה). The question therefore arises, what does בִּי mean in the verse under discussion? No doubt it might mean "son," could we only find one single other instance in the Psalms in which this word would admit of the rendering proposed. The word under discussion occurs as an adjective, either in the masculine or feminine form, three times in the Psalms (xix. 1; xxiv. 4; lxxiii. 1), and in the whole Bible seven times, and not in a single instance can it

mean "son," but is always rightly rendered "clean" or "pure." Analogy, therefore, is against the rendering of the Authorized Version. Now, as we find נָּ construed with לָּב twice in the Psalms (xxiv. 4; and lxxiii. 1), meaning "pure-hearted," analogy would suggest that the idea which the Psalmist had here in mind is the same which is fully expressed in the two instances referred to, and hence my rendering "a pure one." It is not for the translator to decide who is meant by "a pure one." This is the business of the commentator.

I now come to the second phrase under discussion, which is in Hebrew וְהָאֵרֶץ דָּךְ. Now a reference to Gesenius's *Lexicon*, under אָרָ (the root of וְהָאֵרֶץ), will shew that the primary signification of the word is "to lose one's self, to wander," and the secondary "to perish." The question is, in which of the two senses did the Psalmist take the word? I look for a solution of the doubt to the following דָּךְ (way). This cannot be in the objective case, as the verb by which it is governed, in its primary form used here is neuter. A preposition, therefore, must mentally be prefixed. This according to analogy, would be אֶל. Now had the idea of perishing been uppermost in the mind of the Psalmist, he would according to the analogy of similar passages* have said וְהָאֵרֶץ אֶל־מָוֶת ("Ye will perish from the earth or land"). But as he said דָּךְ (way), it is natural to suppose that he thought of "straying" or "wandering;" hence my rendering.

As "H. P." has not shewn in what way my rendering borders more "upon nonsense" than that of the Authorized Version, it will be unnecessary to argue this point. Suffice it for me to have shewn that neither Talmudical conceits nor sectarian views had anything to do with my version of Psalm ii. The advocates of a revision of the Anglican Version need, therefore, as far as Jewish translators are concerned, not be afraid of the phantom raised by "H. P."

A. BENISCH.

THE DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

IN the title prefixed to the Syriac version of the Apocalypse it is distinctly asserted, that the writer of the book was sent to Patmos by Nero Cæsar. But two other points are also plainly asserted in the same Syriac title. First, that the Apocalypse was given to the church by John the evangelist, *i.e.*, by the author of the fourth gospel: next, that it was given to John from God, *i.e.*, that the Apocalypse was from divine inspiration.

Accepting the second and third assertions, I am inclined to demur to the first; and wish to offer a few reasons for my opinion.

Two ancient writers, Epiphanius and Arethas, are brought forward by the supporters of the Neronian date of the Apocalypse. With regard to Epiphanius, I must speak from memory, as I have no work at hand just now, to consult for this part of my subject. Epiphanius, then, held that

* Compare Deut. iv. 26; xi. 17; Jos. xxiii. 13, 16; Psalms x. 16; Micah vii. 2.

the wide-spread famine predicted by Agabus[†] (Acts xi. 28), and which happened in the days of Claudius Cæsar, was predicted in the Apocalypse. If so, we come to the following conclusion. As Claudius began to reign A.D. 41, and was slain A.D. 54, St. John must have been sent to Patmos earlier than 54 A.D., and in the reign of Claudius. Thus, if Epiphanius be right, the author of the above-mentioned title to the Syriac version must be very wrong. The date of the Apocalypse would be Claudian and not Neronian.

But there is an epistle to the church at Ephesus in the Apocalypse. Very few, on reading that epistle, would deny that this Ephesian Church must have been planted at least ten years previously. When Paul first visited Ephesus, he stayed in that city two years. Now this apostle's first visit is very generally allowed not to have been earlier than cir. A.D. 54; and also that it was cir. A.D. 58, that he delivered his touching farewell address (Acts xx. 17) to the Ephesian elders whom he summoned to meet him at Miletus. Unless, then, we are disposed to think that Rev. ii. 1—7, was written before St. Paul met these elders at Miletus, we must think that Epiphanius fell into a very grave error when he taught that the great famine in the days of Claudius Cæsar occurred before St. John received his vision in Patmos. Such a mistake is calculated to make us regard with suspicion any other traditions which rest only on the authority of Epiphanius.

We next come to Arethas, the author of a commentary on the Apocalypse, "who explains all the events which follow the opening of the sixth seal, as having taken place at the destruction of Jerusalem; and he asserts that the visions of the Apocalypse were given previous to that event." Arethas writes: Οὐπω[‡] γὰρ ἡ ὑπὸ Ρωμαίων ἀπώλεια Ἰουδαίους κατειλήφει, ὅτε καὶ οὗτος ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐχρησµωδεῖτο τοῦτο· καὶ οὐκ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἀλλ' ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ τῇ κατ' Ἐφέσον: i.e., "For the ruin brought by the Romans had not yet fallen upon the Jews, when this evangelist received these prophecies; and he did not receive them at Jerusalem, but in Ionia, near Ephesus." And shortly after he says, Μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀποβίωσιν ταύτης οὐκ ἔτι τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐμφιλοχωρῆσαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς Ἐφεσον μεταστῆναι αὐτὸν λόγος· καθ' ἣν, ὡς εἶρήται, καὶ τὰ τῆς προκειμένης Ἀποκαλύψεως ἐνεργεθῆναι: i.e., "For after her (John ix. 27) death" (Mary the mother of our Lord), "it is reported that he no longer chose to remain in Judea, but passed over to Ephesus, where, as we have said, this present Apocalypse also was composed."

And yet what does this same commentator say, when commenting upon "the hour of temptation," Rev. iii. 10, Ὡραν πειρασμοῦ, ἣ τὸν ἐπὶ Δομετιανοῦ διωγµὸν λέγει, δεύτερον ὄντα μετὰ Νέρωνα, ὡς Εὐσέβιος ἱστορεῖ

[†] Agabus is supposed to have delivered this prediction about A.D. 42. Here the Scripture appears to assert an instance of direct prediction and its fulfilment.

[‡] The writer is indebted for these extracts from Arethas to a work entitled "The opening of the sealed book in the Apocalypse shewn to be a symbol of a future republication of the Old Testament. By Richard Newton Adams, D.D., Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, and Lady Margaret's preacher in the University of Cambridge, 1837." Lardner and Woodhouse have shewn the unsatisfactory character of the first extract; the second extract, which is more decisive, was unknown to them, and discovered by Dr. Adams.

ὁ Παμφίλου· ὅτε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς εἰς τὴν Πάτμου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Δομιτιανοῦ κατεκρίθη· ἢ τὴν ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντιχριστοῦ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἐσομένην παγκόσμιον, ἀναιροῦντος τοὺς Χριστιανούς: i.e., "By this hour of temptation he means, either the persecution under Domitian, which was the next after that of Nero, as Eusebius Pamphilus has recorded, when the evangelist himself was condemned to the isle of Patmos by this very Domitian; or that universal outrage against the Christians which will be made at the end of the world by Antichrist, who will put the Christians to death."

Well may Dr. Adams, who first brought this passage into the light, say, "Now since the author of the Apocalypse himself informs us that it was during his banishment to Patmos (Rev. i. 9) that these revelations were made to him, the two assertions of Arethas" (that John received the vision of the Apocalypse at Ephesus, before the destruction of Jerusalem, and yet that this evangelist was banished to Patmos by Domitian) "are directly contrary to each other. They prove, therefore, that their author was incompetent to decide upon the question, and that his testimony to the early composition of the Apocalypse is altogether worthless." Something to the same effect may be said of Epiphanius, considered as a patristic witness to the date of the Apocalypse.

The refutation of Epiphanius's supposed Claudian date of the Apocalypse leaves untouched the correctness of the Neronian date in the Syriac title of that book. Not so the testimony of Arethas to the fact (which we know, without such aid, from the extant work of the historian) that Eusebius Pamphilus has recorded that the evangelist John was condemned to the isle of Patmos by Domitian.

Now is it assuming too much to say that if the well-known ecclesiastical historian Eusebius, probably the best informed writer on church history of his day, had thought fit to prefix a chronological title to his Greek MS. of the Apocalypse, he would certainly have placed in it the name of *Domitian*, and not that of Nero? Is not such a highly probable conjecture sufficient at least to neutralize the Syriac title of the Apocalypse.

If it be replied that Eusebius flourished in the early part of the fourth century, whereas the Syriac version of the New Testament was perhaps executed in the second century, and therefore its chronological testimony is the preferable of the two, we answer, not exactly so. It is generally allowed that the Apocalypse was translated into Syriac at a later period than the other sacred books, and its style would seem to favour this supposition. On the other hand, Eusebius expressly states that Irenæus asserted that St. John, almost in his own time, had been sent to Patmos by Domitian. Now Irenæus was made bishop of Lyons^v not later probably than cir. 175 A.D., and he had known the illustrious martyr

^v Irenæus succeeded Pothinus in the episcopate of Lyons. Closely connected with Marseilles by the waters of the Rhone, it is probable that Lyons had not unfrequent communication with Asia Minor. Pothinus and Irenæus are both Greek names, and both these bishops may have been Asiatic Greeks. Pothinus would be better able, even than Irenæus, to speak decisively as to the name of the Roman emperor by whom St. John was banished to Patmos, and Irenæus may have heard the name of Domitian from him as well as from Polycarp.

Polycarp, who had been personally acquainted with the evangelist St. John.

We may now say that if Irenæus had prefixed a chronological heading to his MS. of the Apocalypse in A.D. 105, and a correct copy of that MS. had reached us, we should assuredly find the name of Domitian in the heading. Are we not then justified in rejecting the Syriac title as altogether without value, so far as regards the insertion of the name of Nero?

Indeed that title would seem to be of no other service than to assist us in accepting the comparative lateness of the date of the Syriac version of this particular book, *i.e.*, if we are to receive what Eusebius says of Irenæus. If it really were the testimony of Irenæus that, almost in his own age, Domitian sent the evangelist John to Patmos, then we can scarcely refuse to believe that such must have been the opinion of Polycarp. Nor is this all. It seems scarcely credible to suppose that Polycarp and his friend Ignatius would differ by so large a space as nearly thirty years, upon a question on which both must have had the fullest information, whether St. John was banished to Patmos by Nero or Domitian. We appear, therefore, to be led to the conclusion that, in the early period when Ignatius and Polycarp flourished, the churches both of Asia and Syria held that it was the emperor Domitian who banished the evangelist St. John to the isle of Patmos. If so, the title prefixed to the Syriac version, if prefixed by the translator himself, must have been written, and the translation made, when the Domitianic date of St. John's banishment to Patmos had been forgotten, and the Neronic date had become the established tradition at least in the Syrian churches.

It may, perhaps, seem to us that the task of translating the Apocalypse from the Greek into the Syriac, would have required a person of some education, not without certain literary acquirements, and who would not be likely to fall into such a grave historical error. This is, however, by no means the case. For, during the first five or even six centuries of the Christian era, there might be found scores or even hundreds of natives of Syria, who might be said to possess equally two vernacular languages, Syriac and Greek, and who would be quite competent, however scantily and imperfectly acquainted with Greek and Roman history, to clothe the Apocalypse in the plain and almost homely Syriac dress in which it is presented to us in the present version.

The late Baron Bunsen, fully aware of the testimony of Irenæus and its acceptance by Eusebius, chose utterly to reject that testimony, because the Apocalypse, as he thought, assumes, in the eleventh chapter, that "the temple of Jerusalem and the Holy City *are standing*, but doomed to destruction." Surely neither Irenæus nor Eusebius was ignorant of this eleventh chapter, and yet they do not appear to have discovered any such assumption. M. Bunsen, however, was more consistent than Arethas, who accepted the Domitianic date of the Evangelist's exile to Patmos in one part of his commentary, and in another held that the vision was given to St. John *before* the destruction of Jerusalem. The fact is, he seems, in a matter of pure history, when commenting upon the ninth verse of the first chapter, to have felt himself bound to follow,

without question, the great ecclesiastical historian Eusebius; but when, subsequently expounding the predictive portions of the book, to have regarded himself at liberty to embrace what appeared to him probable, whether from his own researches, or from the works of preceeding commentators, without thinking of Eusebius and Domitian.

Accordingly, when he came to Rev. vii. 4, 8, "And there were sealed one hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel, etc.," forgetting Eusebius, Patmos, and Domitian, and not improbably thinking that the eleventh chapter foretold the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by the Romans under Titus, and that the expression in vii. 4—"of every tribe of Israel"—must be understood literally of the literal seed of Abraham, and therefore must have reference to events which happened before the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the nation; Arethas would naturally seek for the fulfilment of the prediction in the Acts of the Apostles. We are not therefore to be very much surprised if we find him thus expressing himself, in his exposition of Rev. vii. 4, 8: Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἦσαν καὶ ἀριθμὸν ὑπερβάλλοντες οἱ Χριστῷ πιστεύσαντες ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Καὶ μαρτύρες οἱ Παύλῳ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ γενόμενῳ λέγοντες, θεωρεῖς ἀδελφε ποσαὶ μυριάδες εἰσὶ τῶν πεπιστευκότων Ἰουδαίων· τούτους δὲ μὴ μετασχεῖν τῆς ὑπὸ Ρωραίων πανωλεθρίας ὃ χρηματίζων τῷ εὐαγγελιστῇ φησι: *i. e.*, "For there were many, yea, a countless multitude from among the Jews, who believed in Christ; as even they testify, who said to St. Paul on his arrival at Jerusalem, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe" (Acts xxi. 20). It is surely not very difficult to conceive how, in an age when strict chronological consistency was, perhaps, not duly valued, even in sober historical treatises, that a writer like Arethas occupied in endeavouring to explain the mysterious predictions and mystic symbols of such a book as the Apocalypse, could not resist the temptation of identifying the πόσαι μυριάδες Ἰουδαίων τῶν πεπιστευκότων of Acts xxi. 20 with the ἑκατον τεσσαράκοντα τεσσαρές χιλιάδες ἐσφραγισμένοι ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ of Rev. vii. 4. The reverential, patient, cautious, self-distrustful and prayerful study of the Apocalypse, involving, as it necessarily does, a similar study of the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament, will be regarded by not a few as one of the noblest and sublimest tasks which can occupy the mind and thoughts of the devout believer in that crucified and risen One who has brought life and immortality to light in His gospel. But the superstitious and highly imaginative, the superficial and self-confident, are wholly incompetent to such a task. Epiphanius too, seeing that in the Acts (xi. 24) Agabus had predicted λιμὸν μέγαν ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, and that the sacred historian had asserted expressly its fulfilment in the reign of Claudius, could not withstand the impression of the (to him) plausible connexion of this famine with that predicted in the Apocalypse (vi. 8); though the ἐξουσία ἐπὶ τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς of the latter is not altogether consistent with the ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην of the former. Epiphanius and Arethas may warn us against rashly trusting to ancient expositors of the Apocalypse, all of whom would be intensely ignorant (and necessarily so), that as late as in the year 1862 after the incarnation and birth of Him who is

at once the Son of God and the Son of man—the religion of this glorious Lord and Saviour would still be deformed and misrepresented by the so-called Greek and Romish churches, especially the latter, having Rome for its metropolis—and that vital evangelical truth would still have a sharp and almost mortal conflict to maintain against the world and Satan. And if such men as Arius had forced upon their minds the thought of the smoke^w and locusts which issued from the abyss (ἐκ τοῦ φρέατος τῆς ἀβύσσου), how little would these ancient commentators dream that at so late a period of the Christian era as A.D. 1862, a book should be in wide circulation and eagerly perused in the most enlightened kingdom in Christendom—a book penned and published by professed ministers of Christ (with one exception) who should have been the last to pen and publish such a volume—a book evidently calculated, not like the preaching of the herald John the Baptist, to prepare the way of the Lord, but rather to prepare the way for the bold denial of the possibility of prediction and miracle, and, therefore, for the utter rejection of the book of the Hebrew prophets as mere human and harmless forgeries, and for the not less utter rejection of the miraculous conception, incarnation, transfiguration on the mount, resurrection, ascension, and intercession at the right hand of God, of Jesus of Nazareth;—a triumph which the powers of darkness have, through eighteen centuries, fiercely and vainly struggled to achieve.

Something further may be said in explication of the substitution of the name of Nero for that of Domitian. It is scarcely doubtful, as Nero was the *first* (and perhaps the most ferocious) imperial persecutor of the Christians, and as his character was so flagrantly notorious in other respects, that the memory of his name, of his terrible persecution, and of the fact that the apostles Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom in his reign, would be kept alive through successive centuries in the authentic historical traditions of the church. It is, therefore, quite conceivable how the less notorious name of Domitian may have gradually disappeared, and given place to that of Nero, to whom, as the imperial author of the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, the banishment of their fellow apostle John to Patmos would naturally be ascribed. There is also another circumstance which should not be passed over. The martyrdoms of St. Peter and St. Paul were to be expected from the statements of the New Testament, and St. John's banishment to Patmos is expressly affirmed at the commencement of the Apocalypse. But there is no express Scriptural authority to lead us to receive the tradition that the beloved disciple was plunged into a caldron of boiling oil; though such a passage as Mark xvi. 17, 18, may make us cautious how we reject it as a pious fiction. But if the caldron of boiling oil were associated with the name and reign of Nero—and in subsequent generations the popular mind would scarcely believe that St. John had wholly escaped the malignity of the emperor who had put to death the apostles Peter and Paul—what would be more natural than for tradition to assume that this imperial persecutor, having failed in his cruel attempt to destroy his intended victim, exiled him to

^w Rev. ix. 1, 2.

the little isle of Patmos. At all events it is much more easy to conceive how the name of Nero should displace the less notorious one of Domitian, than that the latter should set aside the former.

These conjectures are, perhaps, not weakened by the following consideration. Nero and Domitian were two of the twelve sovereigns to whom belonged the common title of Cæsar. This would render perplexity and substitution, to say the least, quite possible. It might speedily become the established usage among Christians merely to say that it was Cæsar who put to death St. Peter and St. Paul; and that it was also Cæsar who banished St. John to Patmos. This would lead to another established formula:—"St. Paul and St. Peter were put to death, and St. John thrown into boiling oil and afterwards banished by Cæsar," i.e. by one and the same Cæsar. If therefore, after the establishment of this latter formula, a Syrian, to whom Greek and Syriac were alike vernacular, and who knew but little either of Roman or ecclesiastical history except from traditional sources, should wish to translate the Apocalypse into the Syriac, and prefix a title containing the name of the particular Cæsar by whom the Evangelist was sent to Patmos, would he not be likely to take for granted that St. John was banished by the same persecuting Nero Cæsar by whom martyrdom was inflicted on St. Paul and St. Peter?

We have already alluded to the view of the late Baron Bunsen, who affirmed that St. John must have seen the "Revelation" before A.D. 70, because Jerusalem was destroyed in that year, and, as this writer conceived, the Apocalypse itself assumes "in the eleventh chapter that the temple of Jerusalem and the Holy City *are standing*, but doomed to destruction."

To this idea (which assumes *ναὸς* to be equivalent to *ἱερὸν*) Canon Wordsworth thus replies:—"Hitherto almost all interpreters that have written on this subject, have supposed that by the temple (*ναὸς* not *ἱερὸν*) and the 'Holy City,' St. John, in the eleventh chapter of the book of Revelation, means the Christian Church. 'That this is the real sense of the passage,' says Vitranga,^v 'no one denies, and the sacred writers clearly shew.' Evidently that passage cannot have any reference to the *Jewish* temple. For a distinction is there made between the fate of the *ναὸς* or sanctuary, and the doom of the court of the temple; the former is to be measured but not the latter. And why this difference? Because the court is given to the Gentiles, and they shall tread the Holy City forty and two months. But no such distinction was made between the sanctuary and court of the temple at *Jerusalem*. *Both* were given up to the Gentiles; both were involved in one and the same destruction by the imperial armies of Rome."

M. Bunsen considered the city in Rev. xvii. 18 to be *imperial* Rome. Dr. Wordsworth differs from this view, assigning as his reason, that when the city is destroyed, it will become a wilderness, a "habitation of devils, the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird," (Rev. xviii. 2;) whereas "no such local desolation took place when

^v Dr. Wordsworth has here the following note. "Ad locum. This has been further shewn by Mr. Elliott, Hengstenberg, Davidson, and others."

the Roman empire fell, and the ecclesiastical power succeeded in its room. Therefore the city is indeed Rome, but *not* Rome in its imperial form."

M. Bunsen, referring to chap. xvii. 10, says that the seven kings must be seven Roman Emperors—that the first five were Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero. Accordingly "the words 'the fifth is fallen' imply that Nero was dead when the vision of the Apocalypse took place; the one who is then reigning must be Galba, and the other who is not yet come, and is to remain a short time, will be Otho."

Dr. Wordsworth objects to the arbitrary omission of the name of Julius Cæsar from the list; adding that, according to M. Bunsen's postulates, Vitellius must be the eighth emperor, and therefore the eighth king, and consequently the beast of the Apocalypse. Dr. W. adds that it follows from this that Vitellius must have been a great and successful persecutor of the saints—that there must have been other ten kings receiving power together with Vitellius, who must have made the city desolate, and have burnt it with fire. We cannot, therefore, accept Baron Bunsen's view, that it was when Galba was reigning that St. John received the Apocalyptic vision.

M. Bunsen thinks also that the Greek of the Apocalyptic vision is so ungrammatical and unheavenly, that no scholar can seriously believe St. John to have written the Apocalypse nearly in the same year in which he wrote his gospel. Dr. Wordsworth replies that "the Apocalypse has a grammar of its own, the grammar of inspiration."

Are we to understand by the term "scholar" one learned in the Aramaic and Hellenistic dialects, and well acquainted with the Scriptures in their Hebrew and Greek originals, yet who derides the notion of a real and direct divine inspiration from God into the minds of such of His servants as He has chosen to the prophetic office, and flatly denies also the possibility of miracles? We do not exactly see how, even in this case, the said scholar should, as M. Bunsen supposes, refuse to believe, under the particular circumstances of the case, that the Apocalypse and the fourth gospel proceeded from the same pen, nearly about the same time, unless this "scholar" should also regard the personal history of John the Evangelist as nothing but a fabulous myth. But if we grant that this apostle was a native of Galilee, and that, at least until he was about thirty years of age, the somewhat rude form^v of the Aramaic used by the Galileans was habitually spoken by himself and was continually heard by him from those around him, it is quite conceivable that the warmth^u of his natural temperament was gradually subdued, and that, in the course of years, he acquired in other lands that Greek style which is exhibited in his gospel. If, then, at a very advanced age, he should have written in Greek such a mystic and symbolic vision as the Apocalypse, under the excited feelings of an imaginary communication from heaven, would not nature, so to speak, almost necessarily break through the trammels of artificial habit, though of long standing, and his Greek partake, as a matter of course, of the "unheavenly" (if you will) and "ungrammatical" rudeness of the Galilean Aramaic of his infancy and childhood,

^v Mark xiv. 70.

^u Luke ix. 54.

of his boyhood and early manhood? Might we not reasonably expect something like this to be the case, under such circumstances?

No wonder then that any scholar (and we trust that there are many such) who believes in the truth and reality of the Scriptural miracles, and in the immediate inspiration of the prophets of the Old and New Testaments, should have little difficulty here. When John, while receiving the superhuman Apocalyptic visions, was, as he must have been, in no ordinary holy elevation and rapture^a of mind, all the comparatively artificial^b training and acquired habits, even of sixty years, would for a time lose their hold upon him. And when the divine Spirit impressed upon his mind the successive events portrayed in the vision, with such lucid, vivid, and transparent distinctness, that it was impossible for him to err—and it was the determined and vigilant purpose of the Omniscient and Omnipotent Revealer, who watched over his pen as it travelled onward in its task, that the apostle should not err—in committing them to writing one after the other, surely, unless we suppose the divine Spirit to have taken such absolute and despotic possession of his faculties as to compel him, as a mere unconscious machine, to write what some might call less unheavenly and ungrammatical Greek, a somewhat rude, unheavenly, and ungrammatical Aramaic hue must be expected to pervade John's Greek record of the wondrous vision.

And we have put the case less favourably than might fairly have been done. For we are at liberty to suppose that during the years of his apostleship and absence from Galilee, the Hebrew prophets in the original (and not merely in the Septuagint version) had been often the subject of his familiar study, and that his mind was deeply imbued with the idiomatic forms and expressions found in their pages.

We must rather suggest than dwell upon other considerations, as this letter is already exceeding its proper limits. Not one of the first three gospels was written later than 64 A.D.^c From them may be extracted in

^a Not the rapture and enthusiasm of a fanatic. Nothing can be more unfanatical than the way in which John speaks of himself everywhere in the vision. There is nothing wild, incoherent, self-laudatory. How thoroughly does he sustain the character of a subordinate throughout. We do not wish to overrate this internal evidence in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of the Apocalypse as a divine revelation; yet we may be permitted to ask, if Mahommed had attempted to invent a similar vision of which he was to be the seer, to communicate it to the world, would his fiction have been as free from egotism as is the Apocalypse?

^b Hugh Miller, the geologist, was a master of English style and expression, when he took up the pen. But his habitual conversation, we believe, was not without what may be called Scottish words and idioms. The Rev. G. Townsend, in his *Chronological Arrangement of the Old and New Testaments*, says, "Contrary to the usual mode of arrangement, I have placed the Epistles of St. John after the Apocalypse. The difference of the style in the composition was one of my principal arguments for so doing. The language of the Book of Revelation appeared to be the result of less intercourse with the Greeks than that of the epistles, which bear much resemblance to the style of St. John's Gospel." John's words, ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμος, shew that he wrote the vision after his return from Patmos, doubtless under that oversight of the Divine Spirit promised by our Lord in John xiv. 26.

^c St. Matthew's gospel was not written later than cir. A.D. 43; it may have been earlier. Dr. Burton thinks that Mark wrote about 58. St. Luke did not write later than A.D. 64.

our Saviour's words a clear prophetic narrative, if I may so speak, of the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews. Is it likely that what had been thus clearly and, so to speak, historically predicted by the Lord, about forty years before the events, should afterwards, scarcely a year before the triumph of Titus, be darkly foreshewn in vision and symbols? Let us suppose John to have been sent to Patmos by Nero, at the very close of whose reign St. Paul and St. Peter were put to death. In Patmos John received the Apocalypse, which he appears not to have published to the church until after his departure from that island. When is it probable that this took place? During the contests for empire between Galba, Otho, Vitellius and Vespasian? We can scarcely, without positive evidence to the contrary, think that the Evangelist was permitted to leave Patmos until after the death of Vitellius and the accession of Vespasian, when, such must have been the loathing and horror inspired by Nero's name and memory, that all the imprisoned and exiled victims of his cruelty, with the exception of notorious criminals, would be released. Vespasian did not become emperor until at least late in 69 A.D., and thus John would scarcely be able to publish the Apocalypse earlier than 70 A.D., the year in which Jerusalem was destroyed. And even if we suppose John to have been released immediately after the news of Nero's death had reached Patmos, we cannot well suppose that his vision was given to the church until somewhat late in the year 69 A.D., and less than a full year before the overthrow of the Holy City and its temple.

Look for a moment at the epistles to the churches. The church at Ephesus is not thought to have been founded earlier than cir. A.D. 54; in A.D. 58 the elders were summoned by St. Paul to meet him at Miletus. The Epistle to the Ephesians was written when the apostle was a prisoner at Rome. Such was no time for a true-hearted church like that of Ephesus to fall off in love; still less when, in cir. 68 A.D., St. Paul, their spiritual father, was put to death as Christ's faithful witness by Nero's command. Human probabilities would certainly not lead us to suppose that, perhaps scarcely a year after that martyrdom (according to the Neronian theory), when their hearts must still have been tender through the recollection of their recent loss, the Lord should have had occasion to rebuke their falling away from their first love, and give them the warning menace, "Repent, and do thy first work, or else I will come unto thee quickly,^f and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent" (Rev. ii. 5).

The malignant hatred of the Jews, leading them to stir up the Gentiles against the followers of the religion of Jesus, is supposed to have been one principal cause of the persecutions and sufferings of the Christians. The latter would, therefore, be greatly relieved by the ruin and utter dispersion of the Jews; and they seem to have enjoyed comparative rest from the malice of enemies for a period of a quarter of a century—from A.D. 70 to 95, when the second persecution began under Domitian. It is not difficult to suppose that these twenty-five years of repose from the malice of the Gentiles, though they did not bring Ephesus to the

^f Some think that the word *ταχὺ* should be omitted, as an interpolation.

level of Laodicea, may have caused the love of the Ephesian church to wax cold.

What shall we say to Laodicea? Some think that the epistle to the Ephesians was really addressed to the Laodiceans. If so, can we think that church to have fallen so rapidly into its offensive lukewarmness during the brief and memorable nine years that elapsed between A.D. 61 and 70—a period which witnessed the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul? Whereas, the quarter of a century of rest from persecution, even though their city may have suffered from other causes, will afford a reasonable solution of the offensive and self-complacent lukewarmness of the Laodiceans when John sent the short epistle to them—i. e., if we accept the Domitianic date of the Apocalypse.

Ecclesiastical traditions are always to be handled with caution, and are sometimes better passed over in silence. The postscript to the Second Epistle to Timothy^s (at least as well entitled to be accepted for an authentic written testimony as is the title to the Syriac version of the Apocalypse) informs us that Timothy was the first bishop of the church of the Ephesians, and that this Second Epistle was written from Rome when Paul was brought before Nero the second time. Now the individual who is addressed in the Apocalypse (ii. 1) as the “angel of the church of Ephesus,” is generally supposed to have been the then bishop of that church. If the Neronic date of the Apocalypse be correct, then, so far as the tradition just mentioned is concerned, Timothy must have been the angel thus addressed. But this presiding angel is evidently regarded in the brief epistle as sharing in the fault of the church, and as having left his first love. Even granting that Timothy may be supposed to have afterwards thus declined, can we believe that he had done so within two years, or even a year, or six months, after the martyrdom of his spiritual father St. Paul, and when the Neronic persecution had scarcely ceased? Must we not reject the supposition as too improbable? Another ecclesiastical tradition tells us that Timothy suffered martyrdom A.D. 97. This, however, would be a year later than the date usually assigned to Domitian's death, and in the first year of Nerva. If we could accept this tradition, and suppose that Timothy presided over the church at Ephesus to a late period, and that the church there was also favoured with the exhortations and example of the apostle John during a long course of years, we should have an explanation of some of the causes which kept the Ephesian Christians from falling as low as the Laodiceans had done.

The Jewish traditions, recorded by Josephus, as to marvellous events which happened during the final siege of Jerusalem, have probably assisted to favour the Neronic date of the Apocalypse. Yet what can

^s With regard to the date of the First Epistle to Timothy, “Lardner thought A.D. 56; Bunsen, Michaelis, Townsend, and Burton, A.D. 58, during the apostle's stay in Macedonia (Acts xx. 1); Bishop Pearson, Mill, Rosenmüller, and Macknight, altering the apostle's first imprisonment in Rome, A.D. 64 or 65. Lightfoot, Lardner, and Hug suppose the Second Epistle to Timothy to have been written during St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome; Bunsen, Macknight, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, and others, during a second imprisonment, which was the uniform tradition of the primitive church.”

apparently be less in accordance with New Testament statements than the Jewish legend recorded by Josephus,—that shortly before the final triumph of Titus, guardian angels were heard saying in the temple *μεταβαίνωμεν ἐντεῦθεν*. When we consider our Lord's parting words on leaving the doomed temple never to re-enter it, *ἰδοὺ, ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος* (Matt. xxiii. 38), that "when Jesus had cried again with a loud voice, and yielded up the ghost, the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom" (Matt. xxvii. 50, 51; Mark xvi. 37, 38); and that, from the hour of Christ's resurrection until the siege of Jerusalem, the temple with its religious services was that particular locality, above all others on the face of the earth, where the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth was most intensely protested against and denied, and the truth of the lying charge of blasphemy and imposture, on the strength of which the Jews had surrendered him to Pilate and the cross, was most intensely maintained and upheld,—is it easy to believe that celestial angels would linger there as guardian spirits for forty years, even had the second temple possessed the Urim and Thummim and the ark of the Lord, which were the glory of the first? We are aware that "Peter and John went up together to the temple at the hour of prayer, and said to the lame mendicant, In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk," and that even Paul to a certain degree connected himself with Jewish ceremonies and the temple on a certain occasion (Acts xxi. 20, 26), from motives similar to those which induced him to have Timothy circumcised. But this is far from sufficient ground to warrant us to believe just such a Jewish legend as pious fraud or a heated and superstitious imagination would have been too ready and apt to invent,—that heavenly angels would linger, during forty years, in that desecrated temple which was the very centre and stronghold of the evil deeds of those Jews of whom St. Paul writes to the Thessalonians: "They have both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us, and they please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost" (1 Thess. xv. 16).

They who receive the Apocalypse as a book proceeding from an immediate divine inspiration, cannot do otherwise than highly value it when they read the words, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy" (Rev. i. 4). The Neronian and Domitianic dates involve two very widely different interpretations of "the words of this prophecy." No wonder, then, if they who hold the latter view are desirous of replying, in a candid and Christian spirit, to positive assertions of the truth of the former. In the January number of this Journal (p. 392)

* The possibly legendary records of Josephus may perhaps have influenced some minds in their interpretation of the *ἡ γὰρ αὕτη* (Luke xxi. 33) of the evangelists Matthew, Mark, and Luke, a clause which has been the subject of so much discussion. That *οὗτος* in the New Testament may have the meaning of "that same" (in a future sense) as well as of "this same" (in a present sense), seems not improbable from the *ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ* of Luke xvii. 34, an order of words which can scarcely be considered as materially different in meaning from *τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ*.

is found the following passage, forming part of an essay on the "Position and Meaning of the Apocalypse:"—

"To this conclusion," (viz., that St. John received the Apocalypse *before* the destruction of Jerusalem,) "we are irresistibly drawn by the facts of the case; and, *after what has been adduced, no other is admissible*: and this is the view taken by the Rev. P. S. Desprez in his work on the Apocalypse,—a work of extraordinary merit, the most original, thorough, and eloquent exposition of the Apocalypse in this or any other language. Grotius,¹ Dr. Hammond, and Bishop Pearce, have, we suppose, as well as the writings of Dr. Samuel Lee and Professor Moses Stuart, furnished the hints which are in this volume expanded into a series of eighteen lectures, of great force, clearness, and beauty, and with a warmth, grace, earnestness, and power, at once admirable and convincing; and whatever difference of opinion there may be as to particular portions of the book, *it cannot be doubted that Mr. Desprez has presented us with the true key to its interpretation generally.*"

About the time of the publication of the first edition of his work, Mr. Desprez gave a summary of his views in the Correspondence of this Journal, and the Editor afterwards inserted a reply from me to that communication. I have not at hand either of these two numbers to consult. Permit me to hope that you will be able to find room for this letter.

Feb. 19th, 1862.

G.

P.S. In February last, you received from me a letter on the Domitianic date of the Apocalypse. Should it be in your power to find room for it in the Correspondence of your Journal, you would oblige me by adding to it the following postscript. It may interest the reader to see Romish theologians, including no less a name than that of Bellarmine, solemnly publishing their conviction of a yet future expulsion of the Pope from the city of Rome, when (as they professed to believe) Paganism will, for a brief period, be once more triumphant in the seven-hilled metropolis of Italy. The following extracts are from a recent publication by Dr. Manning, who seceded to Romanism several years ago.

"The writers of the Church tell us that in the latter days the city of Rome will probably become apostate from the Church and vicar of Jesus Christ; and that Rome will again be punished, for he will depart from it; and the judgment of God will fall on the place from which he once reigned over the nations of the world. For what is it that makes Rome sacred but the presence of the vicar of his Son? Let the Church of Christ depart from Rome, and Rome will be no more in the eyes of God than Jerusalem of old."

The ex-archdeacon thus proceeds to give his Romish authorities.

¹ We do not wonder that the followers of the Papacy should uphold the Neronian date of the Apocalypse, and, with Baron Bunsen, regard the Babylon of Rev. xvii. 5 as *imperial* and not *papal* Rome. Grotius, at least in his latter days, wished to reconcile Popery and Protestantism, and this wish may have unconsciously influenced his judgment. The *Athenæum*, in a somewhat unfavourable notice of the first edition of the work of Mr. Desprez, quoted a passage from the book, in which its author frankly avowed his wish to see the union of the Romish communion with the Church of England. In studying the Apocalypse, it is perhaps necessary to avow both a Protestant and a Romish bias.

"The apostasy of the city of Rome from the vicar of Christ, and its destruction by Antichrist, may be thought so new to many Catholics, that I think it well to recite the text of theologians in greatest repute. First, Malvenda, *who writes expressly on the subject*, states, as the opinion of Ribera, Gaspar Melus, Viegas, Suarez, Bellarmine, and Bosius, that Rome shall apostatize from the faith, drive away the vicar of Christ, and return to its ancient Paganism. Malvenda's words are:—'But Rome itself, in the last times of the world, will return to its ancient idolatry, power, and imperial greatness. It will cast out its pontiff, altogether apostatize from the Christian faith, terribly persecute the Church, shed the blood of martyrs more cruelly than ever, and will recover its former state of abundant wealth, or even greater than it had under its first rulers.'

"Lessius says:—'In the time of Antichrist Rome shall be destroyed, as we see openly from the eighteenth chapter of the Apocalypse.' And again:—'The woman whom thou sawest is the great city, which hath kingdom over the kings of the earth; in which is signified Rome in its impiety, such as it was in the time of St. John, *and shall be again at the end of the world.*'"

Bellarmino's testimony is next brought before the reader.

"And Bellarmine writes:—'In the time of Antichrist, Rome shall be desolated and burnt, as we learn from the sixteenth verse of the seventeenth chapter of the Apocalypse.' On which verse the Jesuit Ebermann comments as follows:—'We all confess with Bellarmine, that the Roman people, a little before the end of the world, will return to paganism, and drive out the Roman pontiff.'"

The ex-archdeacon speaks less decisively than the case requires, when he states that "the writers of the (Romish) Church tell us that *in the latter days* the city of Rome will *probably* become apostate from the Church and vicar of Jesus Christ." Bellarmine and his followers were not speaking of what was merely probable, but of what they regarded as *certain*. For they professed to receive the seventeenth chapter of the Apocalypse as a portion of Holy Writ, containing an infallible divine prediction of a yet future apostasy of the city of Rome from the faith of Jesus Christ, and its consequent fiery desolation and destruction. While the acute and learned Jesuit controversialist Bellarmine, Ebermann, Malvenda, and others, admitted that the woman arrayed in purple and scarlet, with a name written on her forehead, "Mystery, Babylon the great," and seated *on seven hills*, signifies the city of Rome, not only as it was in the days of St. John, but *as it is once more to be in the yet future days of Antichrist*—rich, magnificent, and "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus"—these same Romish writers would have rejected with abhorrence the notion that this impious and blood-thirsty woman, attired in scarlet, prefigures a yet future open apostasy from Christ on the part of the so-called papal church. They took for granted, as we might of course expect from their ecclesiastical training and prejudices, that it was absolutely impossible that the Pope should participate in this apostasy, and have intimate fellowship with Antichrist. How then did they manage to escape from an apparent difficulty, with regard to which the prophetic Scriptures manifestly afford them no satisfactory assistance? They were compelled to add their own conjectures concerning the future of the Pope, to the divine prediction

* *The Present Crisis of the Holy See tested by Prophecy.* By E. H. Manning, D.D. pp. 87—89.

concerning the future of the seven-hilled city of Rome. Accordingly, they ventured to predict that the Roman pontiff, who is to hold the high office at the disastrous period of the doomed city's future desolation, will be expelled from Rome for his faithfulness; and, of course, they were of opinion that, with him the majority of Romish cardinals and bishops imitating his fidelity, would share in his banishment. Were they not, however, somewhat hasty in forming this conjecture, and offering it as a prophetic certainty? If, as Malvenda believed, the inhabitants of Rome are, in their yet future apostasy, "*terribly to persecute the Church, and shed the blood of martyrs more cruelly than ever*," is it reasonable to think that these sanguinary and persecuting apostates will be satisfied with anything short of the blood of the then faithful Pope, and his faithful cardinals and bishops? And, indeed, why should Malvenda and his fellow Romish theologians have expected that the future Pope and cardinals should fare better than did the illustrious apostles Paul and Peter, and the faithful martyrs Ignatius and Polycarp?

August 8th, 1862.

G.

A COPTIC VERSION OF JEREMIAH XX. 4.

I SEND you the quotation made by St. Matthew from Jeremy the prophet, Matt. xxvii. 9, respecting the thirty pieces of silver, which, as is well known to Coptic scholars, is found in various fragments of Jeremiah, both in Coptic and Sahidic; but it has never been found, as far as I am aware, in any complete copy of Jeremiah.

I have copied this from a Coptic and Sahidic Selim, belonging to W. Ashurst Ashurst, Esq., and collated it with another copy. It appears to be connected with Jeremiah xx. 4.

I do not imagine that the quotation is of much value, unsupported as it is by any other version, but it may perhaps be worth a place in your publication.

November 11, 1862.

H. TATAM.

JEREMIAH XX. 4.

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲭⲉ ⲓⲉⲣⲉⲙⲓⲁⲥ ⲙⲡⲁⲥⲭⲱⲣ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲧⲱⲧⲏ ⲙⲓ
 ⲡⲉⲧⲏⲉⲓⲱⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲏⲧⲓ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲧⲙⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲱⲡⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲩ
 ⲡⲉⲧⲏⲱⲡⲓⲣⲉ ⲡⲏⲧⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲙⲡⲏⲥⲁ ⲧⲏⲧⲏ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲧⲁⲩⲉⲓ
 ⲡⲉⲩⲏⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲧⲁⲩⲧⲓ ⲉⲃ
 ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲧⲟⲩⲁⲥⲟⲩ ⲡⲁⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲥⲉⲧⲓⲁⲓⲥⲉ ⲙⲡⲓ
 ⲧⲁⲗⲟⲟ ⲡⲉⲡⲱⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲉⲥⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲡⲏⲡⲟⲃⲉ ⲉ
 ⲙⲡⲉⲙⲁⲁⲃ ⲡⲉⲓⲧ ⲧⲉⲧⲧⲙⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲏⲩ

ⲡⲧⲁⲩⲣⲱⲁⲁⲣ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓⲧⲡ ⲡⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲓⲛⲗ ⲁⲩⲧ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ
 ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲡⲧⲙⲉ ⲡⲧⲱⲱⲉ ⲙⲡⲕⲉⲣⲁⲙⲉⲩⲥ ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲑⲉ
 ⲡⲧⲁϥϩⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲡ ⲡⲟⲩⲡⲱⲟⲓⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲁⲓ
 ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲱⲟⲓⲥ ϫⲱⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲡⲁⲧⲁⲁⲕ
 ⲉⲩⲡⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲡ ⲡⲉⲕⲱⲃⲏⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲡⲁϩⲉ
 ϩⲡ ⲧⲥⲏϥⲉ ⲡⲡⲉⲩⲭⲁⲭⲉ ⲡⲉⲕⲃⲁⲗ ⲉⲩⲉⲡⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲧⲟⲕ
 ⲙⲙⲡ ⲡⲁ ⲓⲟⲩⲁⲁ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲧⲡⲁⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲙⲙⲡⲣⲣⲟ ⲡⲧⲃⲁⲃⲩ-
 ⲗⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲥⲉⲡⲱⲱⲡⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲡⲥⲉⲃⲟⲭⲃⲉⲭⲟⲩ ϩⲡ
 ⲧⲥⲏϥⲉ.

“ And Jeremiah said to Pashor, As you with your fathers always fight against the truth; and your children that shall come after you, they will do more evils than you. *For* they will sell him for whom there is no price. And they will afflict him who healeth diseases, *and* who forgiveth sins. They will take the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him who was estimated, who was estimated by the children of Israel, *and* give them for the price of the potter’s field, as the Lord commanded them.

“ Saying, Behold, I will deliver thee into exile and all thy friends, and they shall fall by the sword of their enemies, *and* thine eyes shall behold *it*, and I will deliver thee and all Judah to the king of Babylon, and they shall lead them captive, *and* shall slay them with the sword.”



NOTICES OF BOOKS.

An Exposition upon the Second Epistle general of St. Peter. By the Rev. THOMAS ADAMS, rector of St. Gregory's, London. Revised and corrected by JAMES SHERMAN. Large 8vo, pp. 900. Edinburgh: James Nichols. 1862.

THE miscellaneous works of the Rev. T. Adams have been published by Mr. Nichols in his series of *Standard Divines of the Puritan Period*. He now adds the *Commentary on 2 Peter* as edited by the late Rev. James Sherman, uniformly with *Jeremiah Burroughs on Hosea*, *Jenkyn on Jude*, and *Daille on Philippians and Colossians*. These works are to appear in three large octavo volumes, the first of which is before us. The series is offered at a price which amazes us, and which is only justified by two considerations: first, that Mr. Sherman made a present of the stereotyped plates to the publisher; and, secondly, that a large circulation is guaranteed. Of Thomas Adams, not much is known. He occurs at Willington in Bedfordshire as a clergyman in 1612; in 1614, at Wingrave in Bucks, as minister of the parish; and in 1618, as preacher of St. Gregory's under St. Paul's. It also appears that he was incumbent of St. Bennet, Paul's Wharf. Although he is regarded as a Puritan, and was really such, he was a decided loyalist, and as such we find him speaking very strongly of those who withdrew to Amsterdam to enjoy perfect religious liberty. He was also very decided against the papists, whom he rates in no measured terms, and for whom he wishes anything but benedictions. There is a raciness about his language however, and a vigorous homeliness, interspersed with quotations, anecdotes, proverbs, etc., which makes Adams very pleasant reading. And then he is so earnest, devout, and believing, that we feel there is no mistake about him;—that he is a true man and a true Christian. Oddly enough, he is shunned by a certain number who confound Puritans with Levellers and Nonconformists, which Thomas Adams was not. We should call him an orthodox and evangelical high churchman; in religion and in politics a regular conservative. Perhaps he was a little intolerant into the bargain, but not more so than a good many more in his day. That he was a decided Church and King man, is apparent in the fact that somewhere between 1641 and 1647 he was sequestered from his living by the parliament. This is affirmed by Newcourt and by Heylin before him. It would appear, indeed, that he lost both his living at St. Bennet's, and his preachership at St. Gregory's. It is to be regretted that memorials of Adams are so scanty. The simple excellence of his work has not prevented some misunderstanding in regard to them. There have, however, always been those who have known and appreciated his writings; and Dr. Angus tells us, in his notice of Adams, that Southey deemed Adams scarcely inferior to Thomas Fuller in wit, and to Jeremy Taylor in fancy. This is high commendation, but we are disposed to endorse it. There are passages in the *Commen-*

tary on St. Peter which are radiant with wit—hearty, genial, English wit; and fancy or imagination meets us at every turn. Besides which, it is to be noted that Adams was as learned as he was witty, and that his conscience was as lively as his imagination. The genuine lover of our language will rejoice in the archaisms which he will meet with, and in the quaint and often abrupt phraseology with which almost every page is sprinkled. Of course the spelling has been modernized, but Mr. Sherman seems to have avoided the mistake of modernizing the language, except in very minor details. Thus we have words like “curet” (cuirass), “fleur” (mock), “snaphance” (firelock). For philological purposes we recommend this work, not only because of its old words, but its sometimes early use of new words. Are we wrong (p. 201), in citing under this last head the word “pamphlets?” For clergymen and theologians the work will be a mine of wealth, and we do not think any Christian man will look without interest into pages where talent is so versatile, eloquence so genuine, theology so orthodox, and piety so sincere. Besides all which, we must again advert to the diversified learning and allusions with which it abounds. Perhaps two objections will be raised; that the work is prolix and tediously minute, and that the obsolete words are not explained; possibly, also, that the expressions which seem harsh or coarse have not been modified. As for the tedious minuteness and prolixity of the Commentary, it is true, but the reader will hardly feel it, so many are the author’s devices to interest and beguile him. As for the obsolete words and phrases, the difficulty is not great, although a good vocabulary or glossary of them would have been a benefit. The harsh and coarse expressions and images must stand; intelligent readers will remember the ruggedness of the times, and will not be too fastidious. Besides, this element of the work is actually a mere fraction. We need add nothing to urge our readers to spend a few shillings upon this remarkable work, if they have it not.

The complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D. Edited with memoir by the Rev. A. B. GROSART. Vols I. and II. 8vo. Edinburgh: James Nichols. 1862.

AT page 226 of this volume, the reader will find a note upon Vol. II. of Sibbes. To the commendation we then bestowed upon Mr. Grosart’s edition, we can only add in confirmation that he has done his work thus far in the most praiseworthy manner. Many old books in divinity are reprinted, and rather injured than advantaged by the process. Indeed, it is a just reproach that while old poets, historians, and secular writers generally, are edited with all the advantages of zeal and modern learning, our old theologians are reproduced in the most slovenly manner. If Mr. Grosart does not attain to perfection, he is exempt from this reproach. He has gone into his work heartily, and he has spared neither research nor trouble, and the result thus far is excellent. He has formed a high estimate of his author, and has endeavoured by careful study to clear up obscurities as they occur. The first volume con-

tains an elaborate and most interesting memoir, and a number of sermons and treatises. The text is accompanied by frequent explanatory and illustrative notes, and it has been printed with evident care. No alterations except in spelling have been admitted, and obsolete words have been retained and cleared up in the margin. The third volume contains a commentary on the first chapter of 2 Corinthians. This commentary is of course very full and elaborate, far more so than would be likely to be produced now. But Sibbes was no ordinary man. He was in fact one of the greatest lights of the Church of England in his day. His theology is of course Calvinistic, but his insight into Scripture and the divine life was profound; and his prolific mind and ready pen enabled him to write that which evangelical Christians in all ages will read and admire. We heartily thank Mr. Nichols for this cheapest edition of a most valuable author.

Handbuch der Christlichen Sittenlehre. ("Manual of Christian Ethics.") By ADOLF MUTTKE. Vol. II. 8vo. Berlin: Wiegand and Grieben. 1862.

THIS is the second and concluding volume of a work in which many weighty questions are discussed with ability, earnestness, and reverence. The first hundred and eighty pages are investigations concerning sin in a variety of aspects: the remainder of the volume is devoted to a consideration of the work of redemption viewed in relation to its effects, and in other lights. So numerous are the points raised in these six hundred and fifty pages that we cannot pretend to do more than express our satisfaction with the general tone and spirit of the book. The author is a believer, and as such is a safe man. We are glad to notice the practical turn and application which is often given to abstract and minute questions. The book is properly designated *Christian ethics*.

Das Kirchliche Leben des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts. ("Ecclesiastical History of the Seventeenth Century.") By Dr. A. THOLUCK. Part II. 8vo. Berlin: Wiegand and Grieben. 1862.

THE first portion of this work appeared about the middle of 1861. It contained a review of church life in the first half of the seventeenth century. The present section continues the subject in the second half of the century. Both follow a similar plan: commencing with the Lutheran Church and proceeding to the Reformed. This plan is filled up in such a way that German countries are chiefly described. Foreign countries only come in incidentally. Thus in Part II., under the head of doctrine, we have "the influence" of France, England, and Holland. In this way England gets half a dozen pages, the interest of which is their nature as illustrative of the influence which we then had upon Germany. Dr. Tholuck shews himself everywhere a man of extensive research and independent ideas. His book is one which merits attentive perusal, and cannot but inform and interest those who may not agree with all its conclusions.

Beaten Oil for the Light of Life: being Daily Thoughts on Bible Texts.
By Rev. HUGH BAIRD. Edinburgh: W. Oliphant and Co. 1862.

MANY books of this class are extant, but when properly executed they cannot fail to subserve the interests of piety. The book before us consists of a text for every day in the year, and a page or two of observations upon each text. Every section is almost as much of a sermon as Jay's *Exercises*, but without the quaintness of that amiable but rather eccentric genius. The tone of the work is decidedly evangelical. The author is nevertheless, frequently, perhaps usually, independent in his views. He does not for instance feel required to adopt the explanations of certain popular writers. For instance, the white horse in Rev. vi. 2 is said to represent the Gospel, and its rider the Lord Jesus, whose triumphs are denoted by the whole. Now Mr. Elliott says the horse is the Roman people, its whiteness peaceful times, its rider Roman emperors, and so forth. The New Testament furnishes one half of the texts, and Isaiah and the Psalms nearly one half of the remainder. The book will make a nice present for pious people, or furnish appropriate reading for family worship.

Apocalypsis Alfordiana: or, Five Letters to the Very Rev. H. Alford, Dean of Canterbury, in refutation of his Apocalyptic Exposition, and vindication from his criticisms of that given in the "Horæ Apocalypticæ;" together with a brief critical enquiry into the literary character and trustworthiness of his general Greek New Testament Commentary. By the Rev. E. B. ELLIOTT, M.A. 8vo. London: Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday. 1862.

WE cannot undertake to go over the whole ground of this book, but we shall try, in as few words as we can, to state the intention of the several letters, and to express an opinion or two respecting them. The first letter is headed, "On the Substantive Revelations of the Future, and Prophetic Plan of Arrangement in Dean Alford's Apocalyptic Commentary." In this letter Mr. Elliott endeavours to shew that the Dean is seriously mistaken; that he reduces the revelations made in the Apocalypse almost to nothing, and that his plan of the book is very defective. In the second letter Mr. Elliott seeks to prove that various explanations of passages in the Apocalypse, offered by Dean Alford, are erroneous and inconsistent. The third letter examines Dean Alford's objections to some of Mr. Elliott's explanations, and seeks to refute them. The fourth letter continues the enquiry. The fifth letter takes up various items in Dean Alford's exposition of the New Testament, and subjects them to criticism. The object of this last letter is to shew that the Dean is wrong in some of his principles, and in many of his explanations.

Mr. Elliott writes with a measure of earnestness which might be expected in one who is the representative of a school. Occasionally he uses hard words, if he does not use them unkindly. The chief fault we should find with his style is, that it is heavy, prolix, and often positively

obscure. Its eccentricities by no means conduce to its clearness. These are faults which could have been avoided, and would have made the book far more easy and pleasant to read. But besides the faults of style, we believe there are faults of substance. Mr. Elliott is so enamoured with his theory of the Apocalypse, and so convinced that it is irrefutable, that he will not allow those who differ from him to have any ground to stand upon. More than this; his zeal for his views leads him to lay hold of and to insist upon coincidences in which others will see no force whatever. Many of these coincidences are striking, but they are often far-fetched and strained; so much so that serious inconsistencies and incongruities meet us continually. Mr. Elliott believes that he has found the key to the emblems of St. John, and he has used it for the unravelling of its visions and mysteries. He finds that his translation of the symbols of the seals and trumpets, etc., exhibits a sort of history of the Roman world and the western Church. We say a sort of history, for it is no more. For example, the visions of the horses and their riders, etc., after the opening of some of the seals, are taken to symbolize certain conditions and general features of the Roman empire. It is needless to say that the principle of selected coincidences is a fallacious one. Yet this is a leading principle with Mr. Elliott. For instance, the white horse bearing a rider with a bow, and going forth "conquering and to conquer," is taken to represent the peaceful condition of the Roman empire for a long time after the reign of Domitian. Now, what right have we to assume that the horse is an emblem of the Roman people; that its white colour denotes peace; that its rider is an emperor, and that his bow points to a Cretan connexion? Yet all this, and much more, Mr. Elliott finds in Rev. vi. 2. His attempts to sustain his view are, we are persuaded, very delusive. One of the emblems is made to apply to the whole of the period assumed; another is supposed to apply only to a part of it. Such and many other objections meet us at every step, yet we have patiently examined every one of the expositions proposed. We will not pursue the enquiry, but we do say that Mr. Elliott leaves us more in doubt than ever as to the correctness of his interpretation of many of these symbols. We would rather far believe with Dean Alford that specific events are scarcely, if at all, predicted under much of this imagery. The coins, and monuments, and other things which are adduced as evidence are many of them not such.

As it regards the strictures upon Dean Alford's book in general, we do not wonder at them; for if his principles of criticism are correct, Mr. Elliott must be fundamentally wrong. He sees this, and hence his severity. Some of his notes deserve attention, and we hope the Dean will not neglect them, but others do not strike us as at all conclusive.

We greatly admire the zeal, learning, patience, and persevering industry of Mr. Elliott. He has an honourable name, and he is deserving of it, for, whatever mistakes he may have fallen into, he is a hearty, earnest, and devout believer; in every sense he is a Christian expositor.

It is to be expected that he should defend his particular interpretations, but, notwithstanding his triumphant tone, we do not suppose he will convince the doubter by this fresh effort to demonstrate the truth of his teachings.

Notes on the Gospels, critical and explanatory. By MELANCTHON, W. JACOBUS, MATTHEW. Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Co. 1862.

IF popularity is a test of goodness, this is a good book. The volume before us is reprinted from the twenty-third American edition, and what this means will be apparent when we say that the author's preface is dated 1848. The preface in question briefly explains the principles upon which the work is based, and it is followed by an intelligent account of St. Matthew as apostle and evangelist. Next comes a synoptical harmony of the four Gospels, and after this the exposition. The body of the work comprises the English text with parallel references and notes. The notes are partly explanatory and partly practical, but the explanatory element predominates. Each section into which the Gospel is divided, is accompanied by references to the parallel places in the other Gospels. Last of all, we must observe that a number of small cuts are introduced, with a neat map of Palestine and a view of Jerusalem. The book has been carefully prepared, and is admirably adapted for Sunday-school teachers, and all who wish to have the results of criticism rather than the criticism itself. The present edition is neatly and clearly printed, and can hardly fail to be popular.

An Exposition of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Hebrews. By the late JOHN BROWN, D.D. Edited by DAVID SMITH, D.D. Two Vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: Oliphant and Co. 1862.

THE manuscript from which these volumes have been printed, was prepared for the press by the author before his decease, except that he did not indicate what portions of the additional matter should go into the texts, and what should go into notes. The editor has done this to the best of his judgment, but he has made very few alterations in the manuscript itself. We think he has acted wisely in following this course, because, had he done otherwise, he might have given us as Dr. Brown's, what Dr. Brown never intended. He observes truly enough that this work "possesses in an eminent degree all those qualities which distinguish all the other expository works of the gifted author;—singular clearness of apprehension; remarkable conciseness and precision of language; a sacred regard to the authority of the inspired writer; a rich savour of evangelical doctrine, and a fearless following out of, and giving expression to, what in his judgment and conscience he believed to be the mind of the Holy Ghost." Dr. Brown strove rather to ascertain facts and teachings, than to submit the Scriptures to his own judgment. He wanted to know what the apostles wrote and meant, and when he had ascertained this, his chief care was to commend it to the attention and consciences of his readers. His criticism

was that of reverential faith. The Scriptures were the man of his counsel and the law of his lips. That he was a scholar, a man of extensive learning and of diligent research, we know; that he thought closely and deeply, we also know; but all his learning and mental effort was imbued with a spirit of earnest piety, and the same piety runs like a golden thread through all his pages.

This work commences with an introduction and prolegomena. Dr. Brown thinks the epistle was written by St. Paul; that it was primarily addressed to Jews who had embraced Christianity, perhaps in Jerusalem or Judea; that it was originally in Greek, probably not long before the final overthrow of the Jewish polity. He is uncertain where it was written, but accepts it as canonical. He notices that the epistle is divided into two parts; the first doctrinal, and the second practical; the latter commencing with chap. x. 19. His first volume is occupied with the former. His second contains the latter, with a series of nine discourses founded upon the epistle. The whole concludes with a fourfold index of principal matters, Greek words and phrases, authors and texts. Altogether we have almost nine hundred pages of letter-press, in the course of which nearly every question of importance is touched on in relation to this admirable epistle.

Less diffuse than Dr. Owen, and less verbal in his criticisms than Dr. Stewart, the work of Dr. Brown is more in harmony with the tastes and average learning of theological readers than either of them. There is no particular exhibition of scholarship, such as sprinkles and garnishes every page with Greek, Latin and Hebrew. Yet Dr. Brown well understood these, and, as often as he deems it necessary, he introduces them. It is, however, very noticeable that for this purpose he prefers his notes or margin to his text. He draws out a plan of his epistle like the plan of an unusually elaborate sermon; and this plan is discussed and developed in its details, until a summary of the epistle is transformed into a book. At the same time he keeps the epistle before him, he analyzes it, compares its parts, and views it from different points, in order that it may suggest fresh ideas, and teach all the lessons it is adapted to teach. This exposition is nevertheless not a long sermon, but properly an exposition. The moral and practical element pervades it, but it is peculiarly a review and elaboration of the epistle itself. From time to time points arise which require a fuller elucidation, and upon these the author dilates. In one word, the chief design of the exposition is to track the line of thought followed by the apostle, to exhibit it to the reader, and to impress him everywhere with a feeling of its importance. Such at least is the view we take of this excellent work.

It would be very easy to occupy a large space with extracts and discussions of our author's explanations, but we cannot do this at present. The criticisms are, we confess, sometimes such as to invite a little friendly questioning, but after all the chief value of this exposition lies in its masterly developement of the epistle, upon which it is founded. We may and we do differ from the conclusions reached

sometimes, but we greatly admire the spirit and execution of the book, and we cannot speak too strongly in praise of it as a sustained exposition, a copious paraphrase with the reasons for it. To preachers and lecturers upon the Epistle it must have a mine of wealth.

The Discourses, Lectures, or Sermons in the second volume deserve separate consideration. They are based upon nine several texts, and afford the author a fine opportunity of displaying his tact and ability as an expository preacher. It is needless to remark that Dr. Brown was an orthodox and evangelical Presbyterian, and writes as such; but there is nothing which we remember to have met with in his works, which is calculated to excite the repugnance of any who reverence the Scriptures as of divine inspiration and authority.

History of the Developement of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.
By Dr. A. DORNER. Vol. IV. (Division II., Vol. II.) Translated
by Rev. D. W. SIMON. 8vo. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.
1862.

WE have now before us four volumes of this most valuable and important work; and one which we earnestly commend to the attention of all theological students. So great a man of learning and thought, so ably set forth, has never before been presented to English readers, at least on this subject. We learn from a notice prefixed, that the work will be completed in another volume "which will comprise complete contents, indices, and an appendix containing a historical and critical review of the controversies respecting the person of Christ, which have been agitated in this country from the middle of the seventeenth century to the present time." When we add that this appendix will be from the pen of Dr. Fairbairn, the author of *The Typology of Scripture*, and *The Exposition of Ezekiel*, we have said all we need to awaken confidence in the forthcoming volume. As we have stated on former occasions, we await the completion of the work to review it more in accordance with its high character and claims.

The Christian Verity Stated; being a summary of Trinitarian doctrine especially adapted for present times. By WALTER CHAMBERLAIN, M.A. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. London: Wertheim, Mackintosh, and Hunt. 1862.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN wrote this book in reply to a work by Dr. Beard. It consists of nineteen chapters; a preface and an introduction. The first chapter on Reason and Faith, and the second on the Existence and attributes of God, are followed by a series of chapters in which the Old Testament evidence is stated and sifted, and special discussions introduced upon the deity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost. The successive topics appear to be calmly and ably treated, and the writer deserves commendation both for his Christian tone, and his laborious research. Persons who wish to have a manual of evidence in favour of Trinitarian views, will do well to procure the volume before us.

Thoroughly agreeing with the author in most of his views, we yet have a little difficulty about some of his special arguments. At p. 182 for instance, we think there is not only a misprint but a mistake in quoting Psalm lxxii. 17, thus, "His name shall endure for ever; before the son *Innon* was his name; men shall bless themselves in him; all the Gentiles shall call him blessed." For *son* we must read *sun*; and *Innon* is not a proper name, but a verb. The sentence should stand, "His name shall be for ever; his name shall flourish before the sun, and (men) shall be blessed in him; all nations shall count him happy." At most the Hebrew will not admit more than a slight modification of this rendering. The rabbins may some of them have taken *innon* for a noun, and treated it even as a name of the Messiah, but we shall do well to avoid their fancies in our arguments. The modern Jews would in such a case be among the first to repudiate a merely imaginative rendering, and it is quite certain the Hebrew scholar, whether Unitarian or Trinitarian, would eschew it. Even Parkhurst, whose vagaries were as extraordinary as his acquirements, quotes this passage as containing a verb and not a noun. These are the things which do harm to the cause of truth, and should be courageously repudiated. An adversary will be but too ready to believe that a cause is bad, which resorts in any case to unsound arguments. We dwell only on this example, because it will shew what we mean as well as five or ten. Nevertheless, we thank Mr. Chamberlain for his book which contains much valuable, instructive, and otherwise useful matter.

Realities; or, The Manifestations of God in past ages considered as earnest of the future. By E. R. London: William Yapp. 1862.

THIS is a very beautifully printed book, and its author has endeavoured to shew how God dealt with man in early ages. To illustrate his ideas, he has employed four coloured inks, red, blue, purple, and black. Each of these indicates the character of the portion of the volume where it is found. "The red type denotes the sin of man; the blue, the judgments of the Lord; the purple, His dealings in mercy; the black, some connecting links of history and prophecy, with occasional remarks." The portions of Scripture history upon which the whole is based, extend from Genesis to the end of Samuel's life. The author's intention is excellent, and many of his observations are forcible and ingenious. So far as the getting up of the work is concerned we can only praise it, but we are afraid the writer has sometimes carried his principles too far. We go with him so far as we feel justified and required by the apostolical declaration respecting Israel, that the things which happened to Israel were examples,—examples not merely of what man might do and suffer, but examples of God's principles of action. This is, we think, a prominent reason of the importance of the Old Testament records: they illustrate God's mode of dealing with man, and shew the relations which subsist between human conduct and human experience.

Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. By J. P. LANGE, D.D. Vol. III. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke.

WE announce the completion of Messrs. Clark's translation of Lange's valued Commentary on St. Matthew and Mark. The third volume now before us is characterized by the same features of excellence as its predecessors. It commences with Matt. xxvi. 57, and continues to the end of St. Mark's Gospel. The nature of the work is sufficiently indicated by the title, as a theological and homiletical commentary, although it is by no means wanting in careful criticism. An introduction of twenty-four pages is prefixed to the commentary on Mark. The following are the sections of this introduction:—1. Distinctive characteristics of the second Gospel. 2. History of Mark the Evangelist. 3. Composition and integrity of the Gospel. 4. Theological and Homiletical works on this Gospel. 5. Its fundamental idea and arrangement. The plan of the work is to give under each section of the text, references to parallel passages, critical notes, doctrinal reflections and homiletical hints. Persons engaged in the careful study of the Gospels, and especially the clergy, will find this work a most valuable auxiliary. In the various departments of his book, Dr. Lange introduces frequent observations from other writers of eminence. The translation appears to be made with commendable care.

A few words with Bishop Colenso on the subject of the Exodus of the Israelites, and the position of Mount Sinai. By CHARLES T. BEKE, Ph.D., F.S.A. London: Williams and Norgate.

THIS pamphlet is in the form of a letter to Dr. Colenso. The author doubts whether the Bishop has proved that the Sinaitic Peninsula has undergone no physical changes since the Exodus. He thinks on the contrary that considerable changes have taken place in that region, which, however, he believes was not the scene of Israel's wanderings. Just as he supposes the traditional holy sites at Jerusalem are not the true ones, so he supposes the common opinions about Sinai are erroneous. It is his persuasion that a like mistake prevails respecting Harran in Padan Aram, which he believes must be sought for near Damascus. After stating his reasons for this last view, Mr. Beke discusses some geographical questions arising out of the mention of Midian and Sinai. He finds a land of Midian to the east of Jordan and the Dead Sea, and in the country to the east of the Ghor of Jordan and the Dead Sea, he looks for the true Sinai and Horeb. He thinks, moreover, that the Mizraim of the Bible is not Egypt. It is therefore apparent that in putting down the objections of the Bishop, he has recourse to ingenious and novel hypotheses which will be sure of equal opposition. We are quite sure that the Bishop is wrong in his argument; but we are not disposed to think that Mr. Beke is right. The substitution of one difficulty for another brings us no nearer to a solution.

Conciliengeschichte, Nach den Quellen bearbeitet. Von Dr. CARL JOSEPH HEFELE. Vol. V. Part I. Freiburgim Breisgau: Herder.

It was in 1855 that the first volume of this work made its appearance. The author has continued his laborious and responsible undertaking thus far, and we hope to see its completion. The importance and value of a good history of the Councils is too generally admitted to require proof. Possibly it may not be so unquestionable, although we suspect it is more than probable, that such a work would be best written by a Roman Catholic.. Dr. Hefeale is a Roman Catholic, and he naturally falls into the erroneous views of his communion on many points, but he is not exactly a bigot, and he is a painstaking and diligent student whom few sources of information can escape. The issue before us commences with the Synods or Councils held under Gregory VII., and carries down the history till 1160. From the accession of Gregory to the date just named, synodical action was frequent, and two of the Councils called general were held. These general Councils were, the first Lateran in 1123, and the second Lateran in 1139. The Council of 1123 is remarkable, among other accounts, on this, that it is the first Western Council which claims to be Œcumenical. There are many interesting things in this book, not the least of which is the accounts of Abailard. We strongly commend the work to the notice of students of Church history, who can hardly afford to pass it over.

Wissenschaftliche Blätter aus der Veitel Heine Ephraim'schen Lehranstalt (Beth Ha-Midrasch) in Berlin. First Series. Berlin: Asher and Co.

THE papers contained in this publication are three in number. First, an account of the manuscripts and first collective editions of the Babylonian Talmud, by F. Lebrecht; secondly, an Arabic Commentary on Joshua, by Rabbi Tanchum of Jerusalem, edited by H. Haarbrücker; thirdly, on the Pseudepigraphic Literature of the Middle Ages, by M. Steinschneider. Prefixed to the essays is a notice by Lebrecht, respecting the institution named in the title, and founded by Veitel Heine Ephraim. The studies carried on in this institution, especially involve Jewish literature and Shemitic languages. Dr. Lebrecht's paper on the Babylonian Talmud is not only learned, but full of information respecting manuscripts. This treatise is to be continued. Dr. Haarbrucker gives us an Arabic text with a short introduction. The paper of Steinschneider is remarkably curious, containing as it does the results of very extensive investigations into that class of literature of which he treats. Those who have a taste for the curiosities of literature, and who can appreciate the erudition and research of such compositions as the first and third in this collection, will be both instructed and gratified. The rage for producing spurious works was endemic among the Jews for ages, and, as we all know, by no means confined to them.

Obrigkeit und Unterthan. Predigten über das bürgerliche Leben im Staate. By Dr. W. HOFFMANN. Berlin: Wiegandt and Grieben.

FIFTEEN sermons of moderate length, and carefully written by one of the leading Prussian clergy. The sermons are sound and practical, and, let us add, decidedly loyal, as becomes a court preacher.

Der Zweite Brief Petri und der Brief Judä erklärt. By THEODORE SCHOTT. Erlangen: Deichert.

WE have here a German version of 2 Peter and Jude, with a continuous commentary. The author endeavours to develop the apostolic ideas, and by criticism to explain the phraseology. The critical remarks are numerous, and often valuable. The commentary on 2 Peter is followed by a long discussion as to the genuineness of the epistle. In like manner the exposition of Jude is followed by some interesting historico-critical notes. The genuineness and canonicity of the epistles is well defended, and the book is one well deserving attention.

Der Kanon und die Kritik des Neuen Testaments in ihrer geschichtlichen Ausbildung und Gestaltung, nebst Herstellung und Bebuchung des Muratorischen Bruchstücks. By A. HILGENFELD. Halle: C. E. M. Pfeffer.

WORKS upon the canon of the New Testament are always interesting, and the one here indicated is no exception. Dr. Hilgenfeld's production contains much useful matter, and deserves to be studied even by those who, like ourselves, do not agree with him on various questions.

Handbuch der Protestantischen Polemic gegen die Römische-Katholischen Kirche. By Dr. KARL HASE. Leipsic: Breitkopf and Härtel.

A SUBSTANTIAL volume of over 650 pages, in which we find a large mass of materials, which will be appreciated by the controversialist. The work is divided into three books, in the course of which most of the questions between Romanists and Protestants are discussed. It is to be regretted that Dr. Hase has not appended an index to the very large number of topics upon which he enters. The author occupies an altogether Lutheran standpoint, but his work is none the less one which may be profitably consulted by those of us who are interested in the papal controversy.

Luther's Antheil an der Augsburgerischen Confession. By Dr. K. F. KNAAKE. Berlin: Wiegandt and Grieben.

ALTHOUGH, perhaps, not many among us are deeply concerned to know what part Luther had in drawing up the Augsburg confession, there are sundry points of history touched upon, or cleared up in this essay, which will on that account not be without importance to the student of the records of the Reformation.

Die Gröninger Theologen, seinen frühern und jetzigen Zuhörern: am 25 jährigen Jubelfeste seines Amtsantrittes dargestellt von Dr. H. Hofstede de Groot. Translated into German from the Dutch by A. P. GOUDSCHAAL. Gotha: A. Perthes.

THE Gröningen school of theology is one which advocates principles of the neologian class. Professor Hofstede de Groot is regarded as one of its chief leaders. Readers of *Essays and Reviews* will remember where to look for the parallel of the following statement respecting the Gröningen school:—"Its principle is purely practical, and is that of education. It considers Jesus Christ as essentially the educator of the human race, who came at the epoch when humanity emerged from its childhood, during which it had been subjected to an education under law or tutelage, and was prepared to receive the Educator himself." The writer of these words is M. Chantepie de la Sanssaye of Leyden, who, it must be owned, has no sympathy with the school in question. Those who are anxious to see a full account of the Gröningen theology and its effects, from a favourable point of view, may do well to peruse the work of its chief apostle, now before us. We cannot undertake to specify the peculiarities and errors of the system, but we will intimate that in one respect it is distinctly Monophy-site. Dr. Hofstede de Groot says they maintain very strongly and unanimously that Jesus Christ is only *one* person, who has only one, the God man, nature. They hold that he had part in our natural sufferings and death, in our joys and sorrows, but not in our sin. They also maintain in some sense his pre-existence. The idea of God in Christ is laid down as the centre of their system.

Das tausendjährige Reich und die Offenbarung Johannis. By Dr. KRAUSSOLD. Erlangen: Deichert.

THIS essay contains a general survey of the Apocalypse, and an explanation of its visions. The author tells us briefly the views which some others have held, and states those which he prefers when he can arrive at any conclusion. Without going into details, we may observe that Dr. Krussold writes with far greater candour and modesty than many who have written upon the Apocalypse.

Evangelischer Kalender. Jahrbuch für 1863. Edited by Dr. FERD PIPER. Fourteenth publication. Berlin: Wiegandt and Grieben.

THIS useful Calendar contains an almanac, with sundry astronomical and ecclesiastical notes. These are followed by some matters which will well repay perusal. First of all, we have a dissertation upon the Tree of Life, from the pen of the editor. Next come articles called "Life Sketches," by several writers. The subjects of the papers are founded on the Calendar. They are sixteen in number; viz., The Entry of Christ into Jerusalem, by Dr. Schneider; The Resurrection of Christ, by Dr. Riggenbach; Simon Zelotes, by Dr. Moll; Jude, the brother of James, by the same; Nicolaus of Myra, by Dr. Krummacher; Seve-

rinus, by Dr. Köpke; Willehad, by Carstens; Ansverus, by Dr. Lübker; Francis of Assisi, by Dr. Ehrenfeuchter; Ambrose of Sienna, by Dr. Merz; Gerhard Zerbolt, by Dr. Ullmann; Jerome of Prague, by Dr. Schenkel; Thomas à Kempis, by Dr. Van Oosterzee; Paul Speratus, by Dr. Erdmann; Zachary Ursinus, by Dr. Hundeshagen; and Martin Rinkart, by Dr. Krüger. The essay on the Tree of Life is illustrated with five cuts from ancient monuments; one Assyrian, and four Christian. This is one of the most interesting among the numerous Christian annuals published in Germany.

Calvin: his Life, his Labours, and his Writings. Translated from the French of FELIX BUNGENER. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

WHATEVER sympathy men may feel for views opposed to some that Calvin held, they confess with tolerable unanimity that he was one of the two men of the Reformation age. Those two men, Calvin and Luther, stand like the pillars of Hercules between the pre and the post-Reformation period, nor can they be avoided by those who would pass over the religious history of the last three or four hundred years. We are not about to compare these two together, nor with other men. There were other great men in their generation and before it:—

“ Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona
Multi,”

but Agamemnon will always be Agamemnon. Calvin has had the lot to be loved and hated; defended and attacked; lauded and reviled as much as any man. This may be because he was a man who would have gone to war for an idea, and represented the stern and unsentimental, intellectual, logical side of the Reformation. He was a genius, but a man in whom faith always ran abreast with reason; not that his reason was the measure of his faith, but because he had a reason for all that he believed, and reasoned upon every article of his creed. This union of faith and reason, without sentiment almost entirely, was profoundly active and prolific in results. The edifice he reared, still stands strong, and is inhabited by myriads of his spiritual descendants, the heirs of his principles purely or partly, if not of his intellect.

We wanted a good life of this wonderful man; a life which should strip him of enigma, and let us see him as he was. If M. Bungener has not succeeded to perfection, he has been more successful than his precursors. He has given us an honest and an ably written memoir, in which we see the real Calvin, and learn what he did. The author writes in a friendly and somewhat reverential tone, but he expresses himself distinctly enough on all those points in Calvin's life or principles with which he cannot concur. We understand that the book has been successful in its original French, and we are glad to see a carefully prepared translation for English readers. M. Bungener has long been a patient student of Church history, and his residence at Geneva, the seat of Calvin's chief labours, has been a decided advantage to him. With regard to this translation we can speak confidently, because we have read both it and the original, and we believe it a faithful, as it is

an unabridged, reproduction. It is a most interesting book, and one which we cordially recommend.

Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy: an Exposition. By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D. Third edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THIS volume arrived too late for a review which shall do due justice to its merits. It is an excellent specimen of Christian interpretation, and the best book upon Ezekiel in our language. We are strong believers in the author's general principles, and cannot speak too highly of the able and forcible manner in which they are applied in this volume. He has rendered good service to the Church by what he has here done, and made us hope that he will be induced to give us some other like exposition; as of Jeremiah, for example, which is waiting for a competent interpreter in English. We have few men who so happily combine sound doctrine and Christian sentiment, with critical sagacity and a proper appreciation of prophetic language. This work should be in every theological library.

The Churchman and the Free Thinker; or, A Friendly Address to the Orthodox. By the Rev. THOMAS SHORE, M.A. London: Williams and Norgate.

WE have read this pamphlet with considerable interest, and readily admit that it contains some good reasons for mitigating the asperity of controversy, and cultivating the spirit of charity and mutual forbearance. It may be necessary to advocate and to promote the concession of great liberty of thought and speech in these days. For our parts, we see no valid reason why men should be prevented from quietly pursuing their studies in sacred things, and publishing the results, but we claim equal liberty to oppose and controvert by fair argument all from whom we differ. Those who claim liberty and charity, must concede liberty and be charitable. This is not always the case; for some men not only argue against, but deride and mock at opinions and practices which other men hold sacred. Mr. Shore may propound his opinions, and with some of them we agree; to all of them we would give a fair hearing, but some of them we can by no means accept. He does not profess to be wholly orthodox, and therefore he pleads somewhat in favour of those with whom he, to some extent, is assimilated. Our fear is, that he asks for too much liberty. The laws and limits of criticism cannot easily be laid down in an absolute form. They may and must be modified by the conditions ecclesiastical, social or otherwise, in which a man finds himself. In other words, all men cannot claim equal liberty, unless they are all under equal obligations and engagements, which they are not. But after all, it is not liberty of criticism so much as liberty to profess and publish whatever opinions one holds, that is in question. May a man publish and advocate the results of his criticisms? or, how far may he do this? The answer must be determined by his position. The man who is a sworn volunteer to fight

for the North, cannot retain his position or pay, nor even his honour, if he fights for the South. While he is free, he can fight for which he will: but no man can serve two masters. However, we say, read Mr. Shore's pamphlet.

On the supposed Scriptural names of Baalbec, or the Syrian Heliopolis; and on the chief Heliopolitan inscriptions, temples, deities, and sun worship. By JOHN HOGG, Esq., M.A., etc. London: J. E. Taylor.

MR. HOGG's pamphlet is a reprint from the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*. It is one of a class of essays which have special interest to the learned, which cost much patient research, and which clear up old obscurities, but which are only to be appreciated by a limited number. The paper before us is of value because it throws light upon some obscure problems connected with Old Testament geography, and the forms of ancient worship to which allusions occur in the Bible. First of all, Mr. Hogg goes into an elaborate investigation as to the name or names by which Baalbec is indicated in Scripture. He disposes of the claims of quite a number of places, to the identification of some of which his remarks may contribute. He concludes that the Biblical names of Baalbec are two, Baalath and On or Aven (1 Kings ix. 18; Amos i. 5.) In the next place he proceeds to consider the principal inscriptions which have been found at Baalbec; these inscriptions are few, and not all either perfect or important. One of these appears to contain the name of Lysanias, the tetrarch referred to in Luke iii. 1. Two other inscriptions bear the name of Antoninus Pius: mention is also made in them of "the gods of Heliopolis," which introduces a learned inquiry as to who they were. First comes Jupiter; no doubt identified with Baal, the ruins of whose temple survive. The next of these gods is Helios, Apollo or the Sun; and the ruins of his temple, too, remain. Another deity may have been Venus or the goddess of pleasure. Besides the ruins at Baalbec, there are coins and allusions in ancient writers, from which information can be obtained. Mr. Hogg has been careful to examine all these, and he reasons upon them with ingenuity and ability. He makes it clear to us that much confusion always existed in reference to ancient deities, whose personality was by no means carefully distinguished. Thus, Baal might be Jupiter to one, and Apollo to another, and so forth. Strange gods were named by the Romans and the Greeks without much attention; and no one can wonder at this who notices how the attributes and emblems of the gods run into one another, if we may so speak. The worshippers of Baal owned many Baalim, and the worshippers of Jupiter many Jupiters; just as some religious systems in our own day invest certain saints with many names, and worship them under different names and attributes. Many curious mythological facts have been collected by Mr. Hogg in his paper, and they will reward an attentive consideration, not only for their own sake, but because of their bearing upon many Biblical texts, and on some passages in history. It will always be true, but very humiliating, that Constantine the Great

persisted in putting on his coins the figure of Apollo or the Sun, and the legend "SOLI INVICTO," to the invincible Sun. What was this but calling Baal Lord? Our author traces the sun-worship into various lands. We thank him for his learned, elaborate, and instructive essay.

Essays on Religious Philosophy. By M. EMILE SAISSET. Translated, with Analyses, Notes, Essay, and Appendix. Two Vols. Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark.

THE essays of M. Saisset are in many respects admirable, and above all, as the productions of a Christian philosopher. Not that we can by any means always accept his conclusions, or feel the force of his arguments, but we respect him for the tone and manner of his writing, and because he furnishes us with abundant materials for reflection. As to his position, the editor says, "M. Saisset is above all a disciple of Plato, and of him of whom it has been said, *Quicquid dicitur in Platone vivit in Augustino*. He seems to have felt that the task of his life is to conciliate Plato and Augustine, philosophy and Christianity." In this we agree; and also in the remark that "as orthodox theologians, we have noticed details in this essay to which we object; but we cannot help thinking that it breathes a spirit, and is pervaded by a method, which Christian thinkers will approve." The work comprises an Introduction; a series of historical studies on the ideas of God, which leading modern philosophers have entertained since Descartes; a series of meditations and an appendix, besides an essay by the translator. In the French, the work has awakened a large amount of interest, and been honoured with much attention and commendation. We read the original some time since, and felt very anxious for its appearance in English; it was therefore with satisfaction that we saw the announcement of this version. No one can read it without feeling that M. Saisset is no ordinary man, and that if we cannot go so far as he, it is matter for congratulation that he is on the side of faith, and that he is as candid in his statements as he is courageous in inquiry and clear in conception.

A Reply to the Strictures of the Rev. J. H. Hinton, M.A., on some passages in "Lectures on Christian Faith." By JOHN H. GODWIN. London : Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

It appears that Professor Godwin's *Lectures on Christian Faith* has excited some opposition, and that Mr. Hinton has been writing strictures upon the work. There seems to be a good deal of word-splitting in the controversy, and it is plain that Professor Godwin's opinions are not more objected to than his terms—possibly not so much. As a vindication, this little book is written with calmness and ability: into the merits of the controversy we do not enter. There is, and always has been, much diversity of opinion as to the nature and effects of faith. We believe that a man's faith may be right, although his explanation of it may differ from what some would prefer. As far as we remember, there is no explanation of faith in Scripture apart from its effects; "it

is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." He who in some sense realizes the divine things he hopes for, and is persuaded of the divine things which are invisible, certainly has a faith to which explanations add nothing.

Historical Theology: a review of the principal doctrinal discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age. By the late WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D.D. Two Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

WE have not had time to go thoroughly into these two elaborate volumes, but we wish at once to announce their appearance. The principles of Professor Cunningham are sufficiently known, and we need scarcely say that in his review and record of theological controversy, he gives them due prominence. Presbyterian and Calvinistic opinions were his pride and his power, and he could defend and advocate them better than most men. Sometimes he speaks rather more energetically than all will like, but we must remember that earnest convictions are apt to make men so speak. For the rest, on all the fundamental points of orthodox and Scriptural theology, this book is one of great use and importance.

The Missionary Life and Labours of Francis Xavier, taken from his own correspondence: with a sketch of the general results of Roman Catholic missions among the heathens. By HENRY VENN, B.D. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green.

IN many respects this book is one which will be read with interest. Xavier was an extraordinary man, and it was to be desired that a reliable sketch of his life should appear in a popular form. We are obliged to the author for what he has done; we believe few will take up the volume without profit and instruction. The work would not have been complete without the final chapter on the failure of Romish missions to the heathen. It is a remarkable fact that the missions which were planted with so much zeal, and cost, and success, should most of them have sunk into irreparable decay.

The Illustrated Pocket Critical and Explanatory Commentary on the Old and New Testaments. By Rev. R. JAMIESON, D.D., Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, A.M., and Rev. D. BROWN, D.D. London: W. Wesley.

THE first part of a re-issue of this popular commentary is before us. We are told that it embodies the ripest results of modern criticism, and it no doubt contains much useful matter, but we should object to some of the explanations on the very first page of the notes. For instance, Gen. i. 2, "Moved—lit., continued brooding over it, as a fowl does when hatching eggs." This is what Bolingbroke derided as the doctrine of incubation founded on the notion of a mundane egg. Again we are told that the name "day" "in Hebrew signifies warmth, heat; while the name night signifies a rolling up." These are mere conjectures, and should not be stated as facts. The same is true of the word

“firmament,”—“an expanse,—a beating out as a plate of metal,” about which there is a difference of opinion. Another example occurs in chap. iii. 24, which we learn “should be rendered thus:—and He dwelt between the Cherubim at the east of the garden of Eden, and a fierce fire, or Shechinah, unfolding itself to preserve the way of the tree of life.” Assuredly this is none of the ripest results of modern criticism.

The Influence of the Mosaic Code upon subsequent Legislation. By J. BENJAMIN MARSDEN. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

MR. MARSDEN has brought together a considerable number of curious facts, and by their combination, with a series of trains of reasoning, has produced an instructive and suggestive volume. The first chapter is on the Law of Nature, meaning thereby what St. Paul calls the work of the law written in men's hearts and consciences. This is an interesting topic, and Mr. Marsden's reference to various opinions will be found useful. The same may be said of what follows, on the sources of ancient jurisprudence; on laws relating to religion; on the principles and construction of Hebrew laws; on the influence of Roman laws; the ancient laws of England; various special points in legislation, and the constitution of the supreme courts of Greeks and Egyptians. A very high place is assigned to the Mosaic code in ancient and modern legislation. It may possibly not appear that in every case that influence has been so great or so direct as the author supposes; but he is right in his high estimate of the Jewish system, and in his general principle that its influence has been enormous. At a time when some writers are endeavouring to lower our respect for the Hebrew history and institutions, it is gratifying to find a thoughtful, believing, and painstaking student, telling us, as the result of his enquiries, that in the Hebrew laws we have a model embodying principles which universal experience has acknowledged to be the essential foundation of all moral rules of conduct. He has done well “to shew the obligations which legislation owes to the sacred Scriptures.” Without by any means undertaking to vindicate every opinion advanced in this volume, we can say that we have gone over it with pleasure, and that we can recommend it as well deserving the careful attention of the reader. The subject is one of importance to the politician and legislator, as well as to the professed theologian, and to all thinking men.

The Days or Periods of Creation: an answer to Mr. Goodwin's Essay “On the Mosaic Cosmogony” in “Essays and Reviews.” By Rev. G. S. PORTER. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.

It is Mr. Porter's opinion that the “days” of creation are periods of great length. He thinks Adam was not perhaps the first man, nor the only source of our race. In several respects his opinions differ from our own, and from those commonly entertained, but our space will not allow of a discussion of them. We announce the pamphlet, that such as desire may read and ponder it.

The Assembly's Shorter Catechism explained by Scripture proofs. In two parts. London: Aylott and Son.

A VERY neat edition of a manual which will always be popular in Calvinistic communities.

Lays from History and Romance: with translations from the German, and other Poems. By HELEN MACGREGOR. London: Wertheim, Mackintosh, and Hunt.

THESE poems and translations are in general very well executed, and the lovers of poetry will find them superior to much that passes under that name.

Helps to Devotion: Morning and Evening Family Prayers for every day for two weeks, with short prayers for particular occasions. Second Edition enlarged. By Rev. H. TATTAM, D.D., LL.D. London: Virtue, Brothers, and Co.

THIS little manual has been devised and executed in an admirable spirit, and its contents are well fitted for the purpose for which they are intended. We hope the book will have a large circulation.

The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch; with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: from the Chaldee. Genesis and Exodus. By J. W. ETHERIDGE, M.A. London: Longmans.

THIS volume contains an Introduction embodying a variety of useful remarks, from which general readers may learn much; following the introduction is a version of Genesis and Exodus from the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, the former of which is here called the Targum of Palestine. A few notes are added to the translation, which has been made with fidelity and accuracy. The only exception we would make in expressing our hearty approval of this version, has regard to proper names. There is no need for deviating from the analogy of our English version, and writing Nilos, Mizraim, Pherath, Hittae, Pherizae, Gibarae, Emorrae, Kenaanae, Izhak, Jakob, etc. We hope to return to this work again.

The following publications have been received, but arrived too late to be noticed in the present Number:—

The Song of Songs: a revised translation with introduction and commentary. By Joseph Francis Thrupp, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co.

Christmas, Easter, and St. Mary Magdalene. The lost Epistles and Gospels for these feast days recovered, etc. London: C. J. Stewart.

The Daily Service divided into Matins and Evensong, and Morning and Evening Prayer. London: C. J. Stewart.

Bishop Ullathorne and "The Rambler;" a Reply to Criticisms contained in "A Letter on 'The Rambler' and 'Home and Foreign Review,'" etc. By Richard Simpson. London: Williams and Norgate.

The Pentateuch in its relation to the other Scriptures, and to the scheme of Christianity. A sermon preached before the University of Oxford. By Rev. Edward Garbett, M.A. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

MISCELLANIES.

Codex Sinaiticus.—In our last number we printed from the *Guardian* the extraordinary letter in which Dr. Simonides claims to have written the *Codex Sinaiticus*. To this we added a discussion of the said claim, for which we were indebted to the *Clerical Journal*. On September 25, the editor of the last-named Journal printed the following:—

“The charge made by Dr. Simonides against the *Codex Sinaiticus* and Dr. Tischendorf is variously received. Our remarks upon it have called forth the following letter, which we give without comment:

“‘THE CODEX [SINAITICUS?].

“‘Sir,—I have no intention of replying to your criticism of September 11, nor to any of those which my letter to the *Guardian* may elicit in the public journals, until the discoverer of the *Codex* has endeavoured to exonerate himself from the charge of ignorance involved in my statement. Nor do I feel myself called upon to reply at all to *anonymous* antagonists. I have, therefore, merely to remark, that I adhere rigidly to the narrative I have already given, which has long been in the hands of my friends, in London and elsewhere [with one of whom I find Dr. Tregelles has maintained a brisk correspondence], and the truth of which I have far ampler means of substantiating than you can possibly imagine.

“‘I am, Sir, yours obediently,
“‘C. SIMONIDES.’”

This communication called forth a second commentary upon the assertions of Simonides, which appeared in the *Clerical Journal* of October the 2nd. The article in question is of so much interest that we give it *in extenso*.

“THE CODEX SINAITICUS AND DR. SIMONIDES.

“We were not particularly anxious to return to this topic, but there are reasons which render it desirable. Persons are to be found who have endorsed Dr. Simonides’ account, so far as to say they think it possible, probable, or true. It is our deliberate conviction that the story is neither true nor possibly true; and our convictions are shared by the majority of those who are entitled to have an opinion of their own on this matter. By some our remarks have been thought too strong, by others too gentle, and by others not required at all. In our last number we printed a little note from Dr. Simonides, in which he expresses his intention of neither replying to us nor to any other of his critics, until the discoverer of the ‘*Codex*’ has endeavoured to exonerate himself from the charge of ignorance involved in the statement which, in our number for September 11, we reprinted from the *Guardian*. More than this, he will not reply at all to anonymous antagonists. In the meantime, he abides by his former declaration that with his own hands he penned the ‘*Codex Sinaiticus*.’ This narrative, he tells us, has long been in the hands of his friends, and has been the subject of correspondence with Dr. Tregelles and one of these friends. Having thus again affirmed what we have given our reasons for believing untrue, he concludes by saying of his narrative, ‘the truth of which I have far ampler means of substantiating than you can possibly imagine.’

“The Doctor may prefer to wait for Tischendorf, who will certainly never enter the lists with him on this question, and we shall in that case never have Dr. Simonides’ vindication of himself. His refusal to answer anonymous critics is absurd, because it is the custom in this country for the regular staff of every critical and literary journal to write anonymously, and not one of them will come forward *in propria persona* to meet any champion or foe. What means Dr. Simonides has beyond those he has appealed to to prove the truth of his statement we cannot of course imagine; but we do know that the evidence

required to defend his position must be strong enough to defend any position that a man likes to take. The 'Codex' tells its own story in the eyes of men like Tischendorf, Tregelles, and others, who have made ancient manuscripts their study for long years. From the colour of the ink, from the form of the letters, from the arrangement of books and paragraphs, from the material written upon, and from various other facts, joined with great experience and attentive observations, these critics have unanimously inferred the extraordinary antiquity of the 'Codex Sinaiticus.' But in the face of them all, and with antecedents anything but favourable, Dr. Simonides comes forward and tells us they are wrong, that the manuscript was written by himself when an inexperienced youth, and that he has untold and unimaginable evidence in support of his statement. We confront his adduced evidence with that supplied by the 'Codex' and the circumstances of its discovery, and we cannot conceive how a reasonable man can be in doubt as to the conclusion he must come to. It is not to be forgotten that Dr. Simonides, on his own shewing, has not seen the manuscript since it was removed from Sinai; and even if he wrote such a one as he says, this may not be the one which he wrote and says he saw afterwards at St. Catherine Monastery on Sinai. However, we will not believe that he ever wrote such a manuscript as he describes—at least, not under the circumstances he has stated; and our simple reason is that it could not by any possibility have happened. That Dr. Simonides is skilful in imitating ancient manuscripts, and that he has persuaded good scholars sometimes to accept them as of ancient date, is asserted very positively both in our own country and upon the Continent. It is certainly curious that he should now claim that skill, and should avow himself the unwitting agent in deceiving the first palæographers in the world. His present claim will only serve to deepen the convictions to which we have alluded as so prevalent, abroad and at home.

"We have said that Dr. Tischendorf would not attempt to exonerate himself from the charge of ignorance which has been brought against him. He has, however, sent a brief note upon the subject to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and it appears in that journal under date of September 22. Dr. Tischendorf says that he perceives from a number of English papers which have been sent to him, that 'the Greek who has rendered himself so notorious by his falsifications,' has got into his head some 'shameless fantasies in regard to the "Codex Sinaiticus." ' He wonders that English journals should concern themselves about such a matter, and thinks it can only be accounted for by remembering that certain ludicrous characters in the dramas of Shakspeare are fashionable among us: 'This is shewn by the way in which the matter is handled by them, and unhappily the want of tact of certain German scholars has only made him yet more impudent.' So far as we are concerned, our reason for taking up the question was the hope that some who are unfamiliar with such subjects might see the absurdity of the claims of Dr. Simonides. Dr. Tischendorf will not discuss the question because he thinks it contemptible; but he says, 'For the sake of the English reader I allow myself this observation,—that the simplest schoolmaster in any corner of England would be put to shame if, after a few glances at the manuscript, he failed to recognize what sheer fool's babble the story of Simonides is. This story is just as clever as if he should suddenly come forward with the assertion—naturally certified by an autograph letter by Justinian—that he, and no one else, had built the Sinaitic monastery by command of his imperial majesty.' This is about all that Dr. Tischendorf thinks it worth while to say, but it is enough to shew the light in which he views the novel assumptions of Simonides. They are ridiculous; the man who puts them forward is lost to shame, and is a notorious falsifier of manuscripts. They are as unreasonable as the assertion that he was the builder of a convent which is known to have been founded thirteen centuries ago. Such is the judgment of Dr. Tischendorf.

"Perhaps it may be said that this is only to pooh-pooh the question, and that it would have been more respectful and dignified for him to have given some of his reasons for rejecting what Dr. Simonides says. Now a man is not to be put down by being barked at and called ill names; and at first sight Dr. Tischendorf seems to blame. But let us remember, that he has published in detail his rea-

sons for his opinion of the age of the 'Codex,' and it would have been mere waste of time to have repeated them. They may be seen, for example, in the *Notitia Codicis Sinaitici* which Dr. Simonides has read. They are endorsed by the suffrages, which, we repeat, have been unanimous, of all the great critics who have been invited to examine the 'Codex,' or who have inspected the *fac-simile*, the accuracy of which Dr. Simonides himself attests. The palæographic evidence is as strong as could be adduced for Assyrian or Egyptian monuments, which have a *character* that defies imitation. The story of its production, as told by Dr. Simonides, surpasses all the limits of credibility, because it was never possible to execute the work in the time alleged, and because it is equally impossible that it should gather the traces of such immense antiquity, by lying neglected for ten or fifteen years or less. It is not even insinuated that these peculiar marks of antiquity are the result of design—they are due to simple neglect. We do not insist upon the ridiculous notion that the history, and source, and value, and even the presence of a manuscript so solemnly given to St. Catherine's, could have been lost in less than a decade; and yet this is what we are told by Dr. Simonides, now the book is ready for publication.

"No effect can be greater than its cause, and on this principle we estimate the story on which we have been commenting. Had we believed the story, we should have felt it a duty to animadvert very severely upon the conduct of a man who permitted all that has been said and done about the 'Codex' to go on for two years and a half without attempting to enlighten the world. He has done this, and in addition has made his tardy avowal the occasion for putting in new claims to manuscript discoveries of an antiquity and an importance without parallel. The folly or indiscretion of all this will be apparent, if we remind our readers what controversies have been excited about precisely similar texts, such for instance as the Pastor of Hermas, and the first century Matthew. These controversies have been waged about the pretensions of Dr. Simonides, who has, with strange infatuation, not availed himself of the facts which he knew would decide them altogether.

"We cannot turn from this topic without a word for the encouragement of those who are not skilled in old Biblical manuscripts. They might say, if the 'Codex Sinaiticus' is by any possibility a modern production, the same may be true of other manuscripts which pass for the most ancient. Our friends may be reassured: there are features in these most venerable copies of the Holy Scriptures which cannot be imitated. A skilful man, by long practice, and with a certain knowledge of chemistry, could imitate the characters and appearance of many manuscripts on paper, and of some on vellum. But there is a limit to these things, and detection is almost inevitable. The action of ink upon vellum is peculiar, slow, and gradual, and leads to results which can be measured by time. The action of light and air, and warmth, and moisture, are also remarkably uniform. The style of writing peculiar to certain periods is commonly definable. The arrangement of all the parts of a manuscript is also, when taken in connexion with other phenomena, a clue of great value. Indeed, palæography and textual criticism together, enable men not only to fix often the country, and more often the date of a manuscript, but even the class and age of that from which it was copied. A manuscript at Sinai would not in a few years suffer much from wear and tear, nor even from sheer neglect, and the veriest tyro in such matters would never be deluded into the belief that a venerable uncial from that monastery was written in our time by even so skilful a hand as that of Simonides. Our readers will not be tempted to cast aside the results of modern science on the *ipse dixit* of any man. In the case under consideration it would be the height of folly."

Here for the present we believe the matter rests, and it is not likely that many will be found to place faith in affirmations so flatly contradicted by the appearance of the codex, and by the known impossibility of writing such a MS. under the circumstances alleged. In the meantime, it is to be regretted that a delay has taken place in the appearance of the *fac-simile*

edition. But we are assured that this has been owing to difficulties connected with the typography of the work. We have also been assured that the volume will be produced as speedily as possible; and that, in fact, it may be looked for at an early period. After what has been said by our excellent contemporary the *Clerical Journal*, we do not feel required to say more. In the words of Dr. Tregelles, we believe that "the story of Simonides, that he wrote the MS., is as false and absurd as possible."

* The *Literary Churchman* of December 1st contains the following, which we give, although we shall want stronger evidence of what was done at Mount Athos, than can be found in a letter from Alexandria. *Judicat lector*.—"The Siniatic MS."—"We have received from Alexandria a letter dated 'Oct. 28th,' in support of the statements made by Simonides as to Tischendorf's alleged 'discovery,' (as he calls it)—'fraud' (as Simonides says). We shall lay it before our readers in our next No., when we may have had opportunity of enquiry respecting the writer of the letter, who signs himself 'Καλλίνικος Ἱερομόναχος.'" (The letter referred to has since appeared.)

History of the Order of Deaconesses.—First of all, we are not to forget the example of those "holy women" who, not however in any organized order or association, followed our blessed Lord during his public ministry, and ministered of their substance to his necessities, and to those of his immediate disciples. In the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistles of St. Paul, we find mentioned the names of Dorcas, Priscilla, Lydia, Philip's daughter, Chloe, Tryphena, Tryphosa, Persis, Euodia, Syntyche, and Phœbe, several of whom are so described as to leave little doubt that they were what we understand by the term deaconesses. Bingham says, speaking of deaconesses, "their office and service was of great use in the Primitive Church,"^b and he describes particularly the duties to which, in dispensing the fulness of the Gospel, they were called; for the Gospel, as such, was then supposed to be meant for the bodies as well as the souls of men. The Church did not *merely* carry "tracts" to famishing women and children, and leave it to the world in the form of "Odd Fellows," etc., etc., to carry them bread. Schaff says "the existence of such deaconesses in the Apostolic Church is placed beyond doubt." Mosheim says, writing of the first century, "there were also, in many churches, and especially in those of Asia, female public servants, or deaconesses . . . appointed to take care of the poor, and to perform several other offices."^c The earliest Fathers of the Church, Ignatius, Epiphanius, and Tertullian, speak of the same order; and some of the ancient councils passed regulations concerning them. The "apostolical constitutions" also make mention of them. Those of whom Pliny speaks in his celebrated letter "*quæ ministræ dicebantur*," seem to have been the same. At Constantinople, in the reign of Theodosius the Great, we find his wife, the Empress Placidia, disrobing herself of the royal purple, and going to nurse with tenderness the sick and dying of their

^b *Antiquities, etc.*, book ii., chap. xxii., sec. i.

^c Murdock's Mosheim, vol. i., p. 70. Book i., cent. i., part ii., chap. ii.

subjects in Constantinople; visiting them at their dwellings, and repairing with the same zeal to the public hospitals, which the Christians had now begun to erect. Her example stimulated other Roman ladies to engage in the same charitable work. We have a minute account of one of these, Paula by name, who in the year 385 quitted Rome, where she had been most liberal in her gifts to the poor, and with her daughter took up her abode in Bethlehem of Judæa. Here she assembled a community of women of all estates, who took no vows, and made no professions, but spent their days in prayer and good works, having charge especially of a well-ordered hospital for the sick. In A.D. 380, Fabiola, a rich Roman lady, sold all her goods and gave at least one of the first models of a hospital, by founding at Rome a house for the poor and sick, who were gathered in thither from the streets and public places of the great city, and whom she tended with the kindest care. Bingham states that about this time there were forty deaconesses attached to the Church at Constantinople, amongst whom Olympias is distinguished for her self-denial and unwearied charity.^d

How long this Order continued in the Christian Church is not absolutely certain. Up to the commencement of the fourth century it preserved itself free from abuses, but became more or less corrupted in the fifth and sixth centuries; and, for the time being, disappeared, at least under this form, in the Latin Church, in the eighth, when the papacy became finally constituted, and in the Greek Church about the twelfth.

After the Reformation the Order was re-established in various places. In the Netherlands the "Demoiselles de Charité" were presented by the Prince of Sedan with the means of assisting the sick and poor. The first general synod of the "Reformed Church" of the Lower Rhine and the Netherlands, which assembled in 1568, expressed its approval of the proposed effort to restore this office, and adopted various articles concerning its public exercise. It was only after the lapse of eighty-one years that, in the Romish Church, St. Vincent de Paul instituted the "Sisters of Charity." In the meantime, the persecution of the Huguenots had stifled among the French Protestants the work commenced by Henry Robert de la Marck (of Sedan), while in Germany and the Netherlands deaconesses were found in individual congregations at the close of the last century. Under the influence of the rationalism and infidelity which succeeded the first and second reformatations, this institution with many others went to decay. It was reserved for the present century to restore, permanently we hope, this most valuable auxiliary. The want of something of the kind had been long and universally felt and acknowledged; various experiments were tried to remedy the lack; but all were found inefficient until the establishment of the present Order of Deaconesses at Kraiserswerth in 1836 by Pastor Fliedner.

In referring to Bingham's *Antiquities*, we find that originally there were four qualifications required of candidates for admission into its number. (1.) That she should be a widow. (2.) That she should have borne children. (3.) That she should have been only once married.

^d Sozomen, books iv. and viii.

(4.) That she should be of considerable age. These rules however admitted of exceptions, by which virgins and younger widows were sometimes received. The question whether they were set apart for their work by the imposition of hands, has been pretty well settled in the affirmative; so also, as to whether this laying on of hands was ordination or merely benediction. This setting apart was not regarded as giving them power to execute the sacerdotal office, or any of the duties of the sacred function. This was expressly guarded against and prohibited. Their offices were to perform some of the inferior offices of the Church, and those chiefly relating to women, for whose sake they were ordained. These were chiefly—to state them briefly—to assist at the baptism of female catechumens, to stand as sponsors for women, as the deacons did for men, to attend and visit women that were sick and in distress, to minister to the confessors and martyrs in prison, to assign women their places in church, and to preside over the rest of the widows; and (in the Greek Church) to attend the women's gate in the church. Some of these offices are of course useless in the modern church, and some would be deemed inexpedient, while others belong very properly to woman's work everywhere in the cause of Christ.—*American Quarterly Church Review*.

Visit to the Yezidees.—Rev. Dr. Wortabet gives an account of a visit which he and the Rev. R. Grant Brown paid, in March last, to the Yezidees in the valley of Djumeh:—

The Yezidee district, called el Djumeh, is a day's journey to the W. and N.W. of Aleppo, and is not inhabited exclusively by themselves but is shared with them by a good number of Mohammedans and Kurds. The Yezidee families in that district, as far as we could find out, are between four and five hundred—that is, between 1500 and 2000 souls. Perhaps this number is somewhat too high. They are evidently a colony from the large body of Yezidees, who live in the vicinity of Mosul, though it is not known when their migration took place. Their native language here is Kurdish, but they speak also the Turkish and Arabic—the latter imperfectly; and it was by means of the latter that we communicated with them. In their manners and habits they seemed to be more like the Kurds than any other people; and, like them, they live partly from the produce of their cattle, and partly from a cultivation of the soil. Their fire-arms are their constant companions; but owing to the oppression and hatred of other tribes towards them, I doubt whether they hold life as cheap, and are as fierce and vindictive as the Kurds. The finest and most accurate description that I have read of the latter is found in a lately published work, called *Life in the Land of the Fire Worshipper* (two vols. London: Newby, 1861). Their cleanliness, considering the circumstances of their life, is surprising. One woman especially struck us: she was very poor, and her dress was in shreds; but every one of those streamers which floated behind her, as she passed us by, was spotlessly white. Whether this was a habit which they borrowed from the Turcomans, or whether it was an ordinance of their religion, is not known.

Striking in a westerly direction towards Djebel Simaan, we overtook on the way a Yezidee, who invited us to spend the night in his house in one

of their villages; and under his guidance we reached K'bashin a little before sunset. He led us to his father's tent, which was the largest and most commodious in the village; and we soon spread our carpets in a corner of the vast tent, and made our arrangements to stay that night with them. The Yezidee houses or tents—for they are both—are constructed of a wall made of stones, and built some five feet high; and the roofing is made of long strips of goat-hair cloth sewn together, and raised high by several poles of wood. Rude as this structure is, the covering is quite impervious to the rays of the sun and to rain, while it has the additional advantage of securing to the inmates a sufficient amount of thorough ventilation. Two gipsy pipers, having heard of our arrival, came in the early part of the evening and piped for us for about half an hour.

K'bashin lies at no great distance from the ruins called Ralaat Simaan, from which the whole mountain takes its name, and we proposed to take them on our way. On the morning of the 20th we left K., and in ten hours reached the celebrated ruins. The principal part of the building was a beautiful church, built in the shape of an octagon, whose sides were formed of eight finely sculptured arches. The four arches lying to the four cardinal points, seem to have been filled up, and to have led into four separate churches. The other four were left open, and led into small cappellas or private oratories. The building was thus in the form of a huge cross, the extreme length of which, from the chancel of the eastern church to the opposite wall of the western, could not have been less than 300 feet. In the middle of the octagon is the pedestal of a pillar, on the top of which Simeon Stylites, A.D. 420, is said to have passed forty years of his life, and in the name and honour of whom the building was erected, and now the whole mountain is called. Ritter, however, in his celebrated geographical work of the Holy Land, proves from ancient authorities that Simeon's true pillar lay three hundred stadia or seven and a half geographical miles from Antioch, and concludes that the reputed site is to be attributed to one of the many *Stylites* who followed the celebrated anchorite in this new form of asceticism, and who continued to flourish as late as the twelfth century. To the building was attached a number of cells and cloisters, though nothing now remains but the walls, except at one part of the building, which serves as a dwelling-place and hold of a notorious robber with his wives and ferocious dogs.

Leaving the ruins in the possession of our friend Abd'ul Rahman, we wended our way down the steep and craggy sides of the mountain on which they are built to the beautiful plain beneath. In this plain lie the Yezidee villages, in a chain about thirty miles in length from the north to the south. Selecting a village on the southern confines of the plain, we made our way to it.

We took our quarters for the night in the tent of one of their principal men, who entertained us very hospitably, and refused next morning to receive any compensation for ourselves or our animals. After our evening meal we had another large conference with some of their principal men, and we again spoke to them on the subject of religion. We inquired particularly from them as to the tenets which they hold, and we put the

question pointedly to them whether they were willing to become Christians. To this one man answered for them all, "No; we want Christian protection only:" though we found out afterwards that the two prominent men among them leaned to the idea of embracing Christianity.

Next morning (the 21st) we bade farewell to our hospitable host Djimmo, and started northward through the contracted plain, keeping to the eastern side, where lay most of the Yezidee villages, and towards the latter part of the afternoon reached Arsheh, a village perched up in a hollow plain on the summit of a craggy and steep hill. The inhabitants of this village are distinguished from the other Yezidees by their dress, and are reputed by their brethren as belonging to a higher order of sanctity; yet we found them more open and frank than elsewhere. They seemed to entertain the idea of becoming Christians, with a considerable degree of interest. "By becoming Christians, shall we be able to enjoy all the privileges and immunities of Christians?" "What shall those of us do who have more than one wife?" "Will the Christians intermarry with us;"—were some of the questions addressed to us by them, and which we tried to answer as well as we could.

On the following morning I started for Kellis. One of the Yezidees of Arsheh accompanied me a part of the way. He was one of the handsomest men I ever saw in my life, and seemed to me to be a perfect type of the beauty and strength of manhood. On parting, he said, "Look you, I am going to be a Christian, heart and soul; but I shall not shave my beard, nor take off my black cap; and I want a handsome Christian wife, and she must be as tall as myself," drawing himself to his full height of six feet.

The fundamental point in the religion of the Yezidees is the worship of the devil; and it is this doctrine which forms the chief element in the individuality of their religion, and which creates a melancholy interest in the people themselves. They believe, indeed, in the existence of a supreme Deity; but, like the ancient Persians, from whose philosophy this is probably a remnant, they adore also the principle of darkness and evil. In the system of Zoroaster he was called Ahriman, the Yezidees call him Melek Tawoos; and to him they believe that God has committed the supreme and absolute government of this world. In this belief, the claims of God are overlooked, and their worship is practically and wholly given to him, who they believe holds the destiny of mankind. They seem to admit the fact that he tempted Adam and Eve, and caused them to fall into sin; but they regard this fall to have been of a fortunate nature, for it evoked the population of the world and the existing order of things. Their ideas on the nature of evil are evidently much confused, and they do not appear to understand the doctrine of antagonism between good and evil, which was the corner-stone of the religion of Zoroaster. One man, after hearing me read from the New Testament, said, "But what does your book say of King Peacock (Melek Tawoos)?—is he good or evil?" "Evil," I answered. "Well then your book is bosh!" (good for nothing.) Several of their women had their heads decorated with feathers—probably in honour of this King Peacock. The only form of worship observed among them is a bow and a short prayer to the sun as it rises in

the morning—the great luminary being probably associated in their minds with the grandeur of the Supreme Being. They believe in the transmigration of souls into the bodies of different animals ; but of a future world of rewards and punishments, they either have no distinct notions, or they would not acknowledge them. They allow polygamy but not divorce. All the Yezidees in this district are ignorant and illiterate, and we could not find one among them who knows how to read. For religious instruction they depend upon one of their Sheikhs, who comes once a year from the vicinity of Mosul, bringing with him the image of a cock made of brass ; and their worship on such occasions consists of singing hymns in honour of King Peacock, accompanying the singing with a rude musical instrument, which is the only thing of its kind in use among them.

Bishop Colenso.—*The Morning Post* has published the following letter from Bishop Colenso.—Sir, will you in fairness allow me to reply in your columns to some of the remarks of your reviewer in his second notice of my book on the Pentateuch? 1. The difficulties which I find in the story of the Exodus are by no means, all of them, arithmetical. The want of water for the people, except on the three occasions when it was miraculously provided, as well as of fuel to supply their daily necessities, and especially to mitigate the bitter cold of the winter season—the want both of grass, and water for the cattle, for forty years, in that desolate waste, would have been felt as strongly by a population of a few thousands, and by a few hundreds of sheep and oxen, as by two millions. So, too, the rule for observing cleanliness could no more have been observed in the case of a small English market-town than in a camp as large as the city of London ; and the existence of “turtle-doves,” or “young pigeons,” in the desert of Sinai, in such numbers as to be easily procured by a poor man, would involve, as it seems to me, an insuperable difficulty, whether the camp were large or small. 2. I have laid no stress, as your reviewer seems to suppose, upon a certain Hebrew word being translated “armed.” I have only insisted on the fact that the Israelites are said to have “discomfited Amalek with the edge of the sword,” about a month after they came out of Egypt ; and, therefore, at that time they must have been armed. I have not dwelt so much upon the fact of the Israelites having acquired tents before they left Egypt, as on the impossibility of their carrying them, when they had to carry their “kneeding-troughs,” with the dough unleavened, “bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders,” as well as grain or flour enough for at least a month’s use. Your correspondent, “A Barrister,” who blames your Reviewer for conceding to me that, in such a climate as that of Egypt, any tents, or night-coverings of any kind, were needed, has evidently not read my book itself, but is reading it by means of your review, or he would have seen that I have quoted at the head of my chapter a passage of Scripture, which says, “Take ye every man for them which are in his tents.” 4. Admitting that the statement that Joshua read “before all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them,” may be only an exaggerated form of expression, yet I have maintained that such a description, implying that one man

addressed at one time a population as large as that of London, is not only unhistorical, but could not have been written by an actual eye-witness with the facts of the case before his eyes or within his knowledge, though it might have been composed by a later writer, who was only imagining the scene in question. 5. Your reviewer, who finds fault with me for supposing that the priest was commanded to carry out in person the offal of certain sacrifices, for a distance of six miles from the tabernacle in the centre of his camp to the place "where the ashes were thrown" outside the camp, and who thinks that he might have ordered another to carry it, on the principle that "*qui facit per alium facit per se*," has surely not observed the passage, Lev. vi. 10, 11—"And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen breeches shall be put upon his flesh, and take up the ashes which the fire has consumed, with the burnt-offering on the altar; and he shall put them beside the altar. And he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth the ashes without the camp unto a clean place." If the priest were to carry out in person the ashes in this case, there can be no doubt that he was also to carry out in person the offal in the other. 6. Your reviewer also blames me that I have not noticed that many of the laws of sacrifice, etc., were laid down for a later time. Is it, then, meant to say that sacrifices were not meant to be offered regularly in the wilderness, although the passover was kept under Sinai, and many instances of actual sacrifice are recorded; and in the case of lepers (Lev. xiv.), where reference is expressly made to the camp, burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, are expressly enjoined? For what purpose, then, was the priesthood instituted, and the brazen altar erected before the door of the Tabernacle? 7. Lastly, although the reasons which I have already given for denying the historical truth and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch are, as it seems to me, amply sufficient; yet it will be seen, when the second part of my work is published, that there are other reasons as strong as these, though of a different kind, which compel us, as I believe, to the same conclusion.—I am, sir, yours, etc.—J. W. NATAL.

Nanæa.—In his recent work upon Mesopotamia, M. Jules Oppert, in his notice of the tower of Borsippa, alludes to this goddess. From an Assyrian inscription in England he quotes a sentence which he translates to this effect: "The tower, the eternal house, I have founded and rebuilt at Borsippa, and the beams of cedar have been re-covered with pure gold. In gold, in silver, in other metals, in stones, in glazed bricks, in cedar, I have adorned the sanctuary of Nebo and of *Nana*; I have caused to be constructed in its first and last portions the dwelling which rejoices their heart." He then proceeds to say: "The passage which follows is very difficult; the king speaks of fifteen images (?) which he had had set up and finishes the chapter by the emblems of the mystic sanctuary of Nebo and of *Nana*. The goddess *Nana* does not figure as an inhabitant of the tower, except in this passage. In the Babylonian epoch she is the spouse of Nebo, but only at Babylon; so that Tiglath Pileser IV., names her also the sovereign of Babylon (*bilit Babilu*). The spouse of Nebo at Nineveh seems to be *Tasmit*, the goddess of instruction. As to the

attributes, they are obscure; in any case, Nana, the Nanæa of the Greeks, is not identical with the heavenly Venus of Herodotus, who was called Zarpanit among the Babylonians, or Daliphat, preserved in the Greek Delephat. Nana has some affinity to Hecate; she seems to represent the moon in its three phases. Upon the stone of Michaux she is called the spouse of the hyperborean sun; and since she is the spouse of Nebo, and the two documents are not widely separated by time or space, we may presume that the hyperborean sun, the sun of the left or of the north, is really Nebo. In that case, Nebo is at the same time the inspector of the legions of heaven and of earth, personified in the dog star during his absence from the firmament. Nana bears the title of the great goddess. Is she confounded with Tavat, Taavuth, the mother of the gods? The persons of the gods again, exchange attributes with one another; their attributes are by no means fixed at any epoch during which we can trace the Assyrian mythology.”^a

Further on M. Oppert translates part of another inscription thus:—

“To the god Ninip Sandan, who breaks the marrow of my enemies, I have built his temple at Borsippa.

“To the great goddess (Nana), the sovereign who receives my song, I have built the temple *Ga la*, the temple *Ti la*, and the temple *Zi ba ti la*, her three wonders at Borsippa.

“To the god Ao, who causes the thunder of prophecy to break forth in my country, I have constructed his temple at Borsippa, by fortifying it.”

Hereupon he remarks: “These three temples, of Ninip, of Ao, and of Nana, whose sanctuary was composed of three portions, perhaps those of the moon in its increase, of the moon at the full, and of the moon on the wane, are preserved under the tumulus of Ibrahim ibn Khalil. Excavations made hereafter, will separate from one another these monuments, the position of which seems to be perfectly certain.”

From these and other indications it would appear that Nanæa is often mentioned in the inscriptions of Babylon, and was there held in great estimation.

Passing Children through the Fire.—Sir,—Your account of Dr. Brugsch’s lecture at Berlin removes all doubt from several passages in the Old Testament, of which the explanations hitherto given have been very unsatisfactory. We therein read of some of the kings of Judah, on falling into the idolatry of their fire-worshipping neighbours, making their sons pass through the fire to the god Molech. Critics have wished us to believe that they burned their sons alive, and the blame of such an inhuman practice has been cast upon the Jewish nation. But when Dr. Brugsch tells us that in the present day the King of Persia sends his son seated upon a black horse to ride through the flames, in order to prove the sacredness of his character, and to shew to the crowd that fire will not hurt him, we at once gain a true insight into the nature of the superstitions practised by those Jewish kings. This is one of the most valuable of the cases in which modern travel has thrown light upon ancient history. S. S.—*Parthenon*.

^a See *J. S. L.*, October, 1861, p. 235; and January, 1862, p. 463.

Passing Children through the Fire, etc.—Sir, In the last number of the *Parthenon*, p. 632, Mr. S. S. has observed that “your account of Dr. Brugsch’s lecture at Berlin removes all doubt” about the Jewish kings “making their sons *pass through* the fire to the god Molech. Critics have wished us to believe that they *burned* their sons alive, and the blame of such an inhuman practice has been cast upon the Jewish nation.” This is not correct; for, instead of “critics wishing us to believe,” some texts of Scripture expressly *record* the burning of Jewish children to that heathen divinity. Whatever doubts therefore have arisen about the burning of the children of Israel and Judah, and of actually *sacrificing* them to Molech and Baal, they have, I apprehend, been caused by not examining the Biblical statements with sufficient attention. These clearly shew that there were *two crimes*, on this subject, which the Israelites were forbidden by the Jewish law to commit: the second being considered more heinous than the first. In Leviticus xviii. 21, Moses, by command of the Lord, first forbade the children of Israel, thus:—“Thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech.” This crime evidently was only *at first* committed with a view to purifying and dedicating children to that heathen god. But the *second* crime, spoken of by Moses in Leviticus xx. 2—4, was more horrid, and it was expressly forbidden by him under the penalty of death; it is called “the *giving* of his seed unto Molech;” that is to say, the giving his children for a sacrifice, and the *consuming* of them by fire in honour of Molech or Baal. Here the crime is “giving,” absolutely *parting with*, for the purpose of being burnt; and not merely of purifying or sanctifying them, by “letting” or “making them *pass through* the fire;” which was a simple and quick operation. To this first crime, the instance which Mr. S. S. has cited from Dr. Brugsch well applies. “In the present day,” he writes, “the king of Persia sends his son, seated on a black horse, to *ride through* the flames, in order to prove the sacredness of his character, and to shew to the crowd that fire will not hurt him.” So, in a parallel case, we read in 2 Kings xvi. 3, king Ahaz “made his son to *pass through* the fire.” But the *second* and more unnatural crime of actually “giving,” *i.e.*, “*burning* their sons,” which Mr. S. S. says “critics have wished us to believe,” the following passages from the Old Testament will distinctly demonstrate. In Deut. xii. 31, it is stated, “Even their sons and their daughters they have *burnt* in the fire to their gods.” In Psalm cvi. 38, “They shed innocent blood, *even* the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they *sacrificed* unto the idols of Canaan.” Also, Jeremiah (vii. 31) says, “The children of Judah have built the high places of Tophet to *burn* their sons and their daughters in the fire;” and the same writer again records (xix. 5) that the Jews “have built also the high places of Baal, to *burn* their sons with fire for *burnt-offerings* unto Baal;” although, at a later period, B.C. 594, it would seem that these two crimes had become nearly associated (compare Ezekiel xvi. 20, 21, and Ezekiel xxiii. 37—39.) Moreover, in your previous abridgment of Dr. Brugsch’s lecture (*Parthenon*, No. 17, p. 527), you state, “Up to this day the greatest festival of the Persians is the sun-festival, held in the spring. Surrounded by all the nobles of his empire, the Shah of Persia shews

himself on that occasion to his people; in all the bazaars shine lights and lamps, and everything reminds one of the German Easter and St. John's days, with their fires on the heights of hills and mountains. In the same way both natives possess the notions of the ordeal of *fire*." This evidently is a relic of the ancient *Sun* or *Vulcan* (*fire*) worship, which Julius Cæsar has thus mentioned in *Bell. Gall.*, lib. vi. cap. 21, as practised by the *Germans*:—"Deorum numero ducunt *Solem*, et *Vulcanum*, et *Lunam*. I. H."—*Parthenon*.

Psalm xlix.—One of the questions discussed in the "Correspondence" of our last number, has been repeated in the *Parthenon*. We quote the following reply by S. D., whose initials will probably admit of easy development:—Your correspondent S. S. has made a discovery in Hebrew which will astonish, but not convince, scholars. He finds that the writers of the Old Testament are made to appear unanimous in considering the whole human race as descended from Adam only in our translation, and refers to *Psalm xlix.*, at the beginning, where "sons of Adam" and "sons of men" are spoken of together, as though a distinction were drawn between the "sons of Adam" and "the Gentiles," or other nations in the world. This is not so; common men, men of low degree, are there contrasted with men of high degree. The two words "adam" and "ish" are employed in other passages, as there, to denote common men and nobles respectively. In *Deut. xxxii. 8*, the other text quoted by your correspondent, "the sons of Adam" is an expression that simply means men in general, and is not contrasted with the Gentiles or nations. This is so obvious as not to require proof. Our English version is right, and "S. S." wrong. He is equally so in affirming that *Psalm xxix.* addresses the Israelites as "Ye sons of God." The noun *God* does not occur there at all, but the participle of a verb, properly rendered "mighty," "Ye sons of the mighty." Thus no light is thrown by these expressions on the beginning of the Book of Genesis—a book which clearly teaches the origin of mankind from Adam, the first man. The "sons of God" in *Genesis vi.* means "angels" and nothing else, as Hebrew scholars are all ready to admit. They are represented as marrying with the daughters of men and producing giants. The people whom Cain was in danger of meeting in his wanderings create a difficulty in exposition; but we should have thought that S. S. would have known how that difficulty is solved satisfactorily. The fourth chapter of Genesis, giving an account of Cain, stood at first in a very different connexion from that in which it is now placed, and presupposes a different theory of the origination of mankind from what precedes. It belonged to a tradition of another form and extent, implying the existence of other human beings besides the first-born of the first man.

The Mentz Psalter at Windsor Castle.—Some choice works, besides the art collection, which had formed part of the "King's Library," escaped the dangers of "expatriation," and the vicissitudes of the "transfer," as they were retained for King George IV. Among those works is the famous Mentz Psalter of 1457, of which there are only two other copies

in existence; of these, the one belonging to the Imperial Library at Vienna, though more perfect in some respects, is inferior in others. The Berlin copy is inferior to both the others. This rare and invaluable work had, during many years, formed an integral part of the University Library at Göttingen, and was, in a strange fit of equally excessive and injudicious loyalty, presented to King George III. upon the occasion of his coronation, by a deputation of professors chosen from among the senate of the above University. It has since then become rather a matter of doubt whether those gentlemen had any right to exercise their individual liberality at the expense of a foundation over which the corporation, by whom they had merely been delegated for congratulatory purposes, had, as such, no direct control. History, at all events, is not able to record the existence of any document sanctioning this gift, nor what advantage, besides the barren satisfaction of a gracious acceptance of this loyal present, accrued to the University of Göttingen, to console it for the otherwise irreparable loss of this much cherished volume from amongst the rarities and treasures of this ancient and famous library.—*Macmillan's Magazine*.

Growth of Papal Power.—We reckon, from St. Peter's legendary sojourn in the great Babylon of Rome, a full thousand years for the complete growth of the papal power,—five hundred years from the complete disappearance of the old empire before the irresistible flood of barbarism. This latter period of five centuries—which we call the dark age by way of distinction from the middle age—offers, perhaps, as little to detain the careless reader as any equal length of time in all known history. To the Christian student, who traces the divine kingdom founded by the Son of Man in its conflict with sin and death, it is perhaps full as instructive as any. Besides the points we have just touched, it includes the first well-marked struggle between the centralism of Rome and the pride of nationality, represented by the name of Nicholas I. and the great prelate Hincmar, who ranks worthily at the head and origin of the Gallic Church. It includes the gradual attenuating and the final rupture of the vital cord which bound Latin to Greek, Western to Eastern Christendom. It includes the story of the great forgery of the “Isidorian Decretals,”—the most famous and successful falsehood of all history,—which by hardy invention made up what was lacking in tradition, and furnished, for six centuries together, the legal or documentary basis of ecclesiastical power. It includes the distinct, clear development of a liberal philosophy by Erigena, and the controversy of divine grace and human will waged in so sorrowful earnest by Gottschalk. It includes the tragical passage, through the disorders of the tenth century, to that most sombre moment of recorded time, when men everywhere believed that the end of the world was close at hand; and the new hope, the grander ambition, that dawned upon them like clear morning out of that night of black despair,—when Europe suddenly was “studded with cathedrals,” and began to robe itself in the new pomps and splendours of what we know as the middle age.

For near a thousand years the Christian empire has now been advancing towards maturity. And still, in the clash and jar of feudal strife, in

the rise and gathering conflicts of the great Western monarchies, in the dependence of bishops on feudal chiefs, and especially in the weakness and corruption of the heads of the Church itself, it might seem as if the structure for which so many ages had been preparing must remain unbuilt, and that grand vision which had rapt the thought of so many generations must pass away as a shadow or a dream. For during this century the Popedom had been at its lowest degradation,—subject to licentious priests and imbecile boys, and the sacrilege of a sinful woman, and a false priest taught in Saracen arts of magic, seated by fraud in St. Peter's chair,—so men are ready to believe; so that for very scandal the strong arm of Otho had interfered, and Rome had become a fief of the German throne. It still required a long and apparently hopeless struggle—a war, as Hallam says, of “fraud against force,” we should rather say, of ecclesiastical zeal against feudal violence—to vindicate the independence of the Church; a still more hopeless and at length fatal struggle, to vindicate its purity. That struggle marks the third great period of ecclesiastical history.—*Christian Examiner*.

Anglo-Biblical Institute.—November 1862. The meeting was principally occupied with discussing the probable antiquity of the *Codex Sinaiticus*. It will be remembered that in 1859 Professor Tischendorf reported that he had found in the library of Sinai a manuscript copy of the Scriptures, both the Old and New Testaments, together with the Epistle of St. Barnabas, and the first part of the pastoral writings of Hermas. This copy the professor brought over with him to Europe: and having been submitted to the examination of some of the first palæographers in Europe, it was pronounced to be the most ancient Biblical manuscript yet discovered. It was written in Uncial letters, and pronounced to be of the fourth century. It is now being published under the editorship of Professor Tischendorf, at the expense of the Russian government. Such, briefly, is the accepted history of the manuscript.

But rumours had arisen some time ago, that Dr. Simonides—a gentleman well known to the learned world in connexion with the discovery of ancient MSS.—claimed to have written the manuscript himself; and that the famous *Codex Sinaiticus*, instead of dating from the fourth century, is only about twenty years old. At last this gentleman made his claim public in the *Guardian* of the 3rd of October last where he gives his own version of the matter in detail.

This letter was discussed and analysed by the members present, when it was shewn that improbabilities, arising out of the dates of his own statements, as well as out of palæographic considerations, were so great, that it made it all but impossible that he could have been the copyist of the manuscript. It was the opinion of the meeting, therefore that the *Codex Sinaiticus* would still retain its proud pre-eminence.

Frankincense.—I have sometimes thought with pleasure on one link—a slight one some may say—yet I have thought with pleasure on it, as serving to connect India in old times with that Hebrew Tabernacle, which for 1,500 years was the centre of the theocracy.

In the Jewish tabernacle there was an altar of incense before the veil in front of the Mercy-Seat. On that the priests were ordered to burn perpetual incense, a condiment of which pure *frankincense* was a necessary ingredient. Now, the researches of modern botanists have discovered that the frankincense-tree was, in all probability, a native of India, technically named the *Boswellia serrata*, in Sanscrit *Kundurū*, and it is now generally believed that the frankincense burnt in the Jewish tabernacle was chiefly the product of India.

India was, during those long centuries of her ignorance and waywardness, privileged to supply incense for the temple of the One true God. You may now offer up incomparably richer offerings. You may lay your hearts on the altar of God. Your devout prayers and your labours for God, your purity and love, may, if you ask His grace, ascend day by day from the Bengal as perpetual incense (Mal. i. 11), and be presented before God in the heavenly temple, by our great High Priest, even Jesus Christ!—*Dr. Kay of Calcutta.*

Hebrew Apocrypha.—The Old Testament Apocrypha were published in Hebrew in 1830 with two titles, one in Hebrew and one in Latin. The Latin title is “Hagiographa posteriora denominata Apocrypha, hactenus Israelitis ignota, nunc autem e textu Græco in linguam Hebraicam convertit atque in lucem emisit Seckel Isaac Fraenkel.” This work was published at Leipsic, and comprises the following documents; 1 and 2 Maccabees, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, Wisdom of Solomon, Bel and the Dragon, Susannah, Judith, Jesus son of Sirach, Tobit, the Rest of Esther, the Prayer of Manasses, the Prayer of Azariah, and Song of the three Young Men. As a modern Hebrew version this work is curious, but it does not claim to have any critical value.

Schleiermacher and F. Schlegel.—Schleiermacher entered into a close friendship with Friedrich Schlegel, which continued through many years. We quote the account that Schleiermacher gives his sister of the manner in which they “set up housekeeping” with each other. He had previously thus described Schlegel:—“He is a young man of twenty-five years, of knowledge so broad that it is hard to understand how it is possible, with so much youth, to know so much,—of an original mind, which even here, where there is already so much mind and talent, yet surpasses all, and with manners of peculiar unaffectedness, openness, and childlike youthfulness, whose harmony with each other is perhaps the most remarkable part of all. *Nota bene*, he bears my Christian name; he is called Friedrich; he is like me in many natural defects: he is not musical, does not draw, does not like French, and has weak eyes, etc.”

“A glorious change in my existence does Schlegel’s living with me make! How new it is for me that I need only open my door in order to speak to a reasonable being, that I can give and receive a ‘good-morning’ as soon as I wake, that somebody sits opposite me at dinner, and that I can have some one with whom to share the good spirits that I am accustomed to share in, in the evening. Schlegel gets up usually an hour earlier than I do, because, on account of my eyes, I do not

venture to burn a light in the morning; and my hours are such that I do not get my full sleep before half-past eight. But he lies in bed and reads. I wake commonly at the tinkling of his coffee cup. From his bed, he can open the door that separates his room from my sleeping chamber, and so we begin our morning talk. When I have breakfasted, we work some hours without regard to each other; but usually there is a little pause before dinner, for eating an apple, (of which we have a fine common stock of the choicest kinds,) when we talk generally of the objects of our several studies. Then comes the second period of labour till dinner time, at half-past two. I have meals, as you know from the 'Charité.' Schlegel has his brought from a restaurant. Whichever comes first is consumed, then the other, after which we drink a couple of glasses of wine; so that we pass nearly an hour at our dinner. I cannot speak so definitely of the afternoon, alas! I must confess that I am usually the first to take flight and the last to come home. Still, the half of the day is not wholly consecrated to social enjoyment. I have lectures once or twice a week, and read sometimes,—let it be understood *privatissime*, only to one or two good friends,—and then I go where my pleasure leads me. When I come home in the evening, between ten and eleven, I find Schlegel still up; he appears to have waited only to bid me good night, and then to go to bed. I then seat myself and work usually till two o'clock, for from then till half-past eight one gets sleep enough. Our friends have pleased themselves with calling our living together a marriage, and have generally decided that I must be the wife. Fun and earnest in plenty have come out of it.—*Life of Schleiermacher.*

Blood on the Door-posts in India.—Mr. Burnell, of the Madura mission, writes, March 20: 'Last Sabbath afternoon, a native teacher went with me to a village near, where we found a pongul (rice boiling) going on in honour of an evil spirit, called Amman. Before the door of nearly every house, holes had been dug for fire, and in new vessels new rice was to be cooked. Near one, a young goat was sacrificed, its head being cut off; and while the blood was yet flowing in a jet from the trunk, it was held against the wall at each side of the doors, so that it required very little of figure to say it was the striking of blood on the two side-posts of the door (Exod. xii. 7). The floor of the house was also sprinkled in the same way, and as the sacrifice was to this Amman to keep away the pestilence, the cholera—the destroying angel, in short—it was not strange that the teacher should observe the coincidence between it and the passover, and the sprinkling of the blood of the Paschal Lamb.'

END OF VOLUME II. (NEW SERIES).

London: Mitchell and Son, Printers, 24 Wardour Street, W.





